FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 009 *14 January 1980*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Shishkovskiy, Katin, Lomeyko] CC 1
Brezhnev Interview CC 1
Marchais Visit CC 2
Erratic Carter Policies CC 2
Events in Afghanistan CC 4
Brown Visit to China CC 5
European Irritation with U.S. CC 7
Troyanovskiy Defends Soviet Role in Afghanistan CC 7
Indian Statement CC 9
Angolan Support CC 10
PDRY, Lao, Bloc Backing CC 10
Qotzbzadeh Letter to Waldheim on Iran's Positions CC 11
USSR Vetoes UN Sanctions Against Iran CC 11
Minister Denies Fishing Vessels Engage in Espionage [Munoz in Madrid EL PAIS 2 Jan] CC 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Brezhnev Scores Administration Steps, Actions in World [PRAVDA 13 Jan] A 1
More on Carter's Cutbacks in Trade to USSR A 6
Trade Official on Cutbacks A 6
Plan 'To Hoodwink' Farmers A 8
Sanctions 'Could Boomerang' [Glazunov] A 8
Pressure on Japan [Ponomarev] A 9
Authorities Perpetrate 'Another Crude Provocation' A 10
Afghanistan Part of 'Strategic Arc' Around Southern USSR A 10
TRUD Derides West's Hysterical Reaction' to Afghan Events [Babich, 8 Jan] A 11
Reports on U.S. Military Aid Plans for Pakistan A 12
State Department, Foreign Press A 13
Vance Statement on Sanctions Against Iran A 14
USSR Opposition to Sanctions [Ariyevich] A 14
Carter Accused of Increasing Pressure on Iran A 15
U.S. Planning Military Action Against Iran A 16
'Blatant Interference, Diktat' With Respect to Other Countries [Levchenko] A 17
Efforts To Save Shah From Extradition Not Abandoned A 18
Washington Wants To Keep Details of Shah's Regime Secret A 18
Afghan, Iran Used as Pretext to Secure 'Free Hand' for CIA [Biryukov] A 19
Correspondents Report on Carter Moves, Aswan Meeting [Petko] A 20

Kobysh Attack on Brzezinski Influence on U.S. Policy A 22
[IZVESTIYA 11 Jan]
Administration 'Has Not Proved Equal to Great-Power Responsibility' A 24
[Kolesnichenko in PRAVDA 10 Jan]

CHINA

Further Commentary on Secretary Brown's Visit B 1
Military Sales B 1
Dangers of Alliance With U.S. [Lavrov] B 1
Shalygin Commentary B 2

NORTHEAST ASIA

Reportage on Secretary Brown's Visit to Japan C 1
Arrival in Tokyo C 1
Meetings With Ministers C 1
Japan 'Pressed' To Cooperate With U.S. Mideast Strategy C 1
[Anatolyev]
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Scores Japanese 'Militarization Policy' C 2
[Kuchko, 8 Jan]
DPRK Proposes Initiative To Unite North, South Korea C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Karmal Sends Message to Khomeyni, Seeks 'Closest Relations' D 1
Brezhnev Remarks Receive Wide Support in Afghanistan D 1
[Seyful-Mulyukov, Bazilyevich]
Afghan Government, Party Leaders Appointed, Karmal Chairs Plenum D 2
Claim of Soviet Army 'Occupying' Kabul Rejected D 3
[Kornilov, Musin]
All Afghan Political Prisoners Freed; Secret Prisons Suspected D 4
Day of Mourning D 4
KAM Security Organization Abolished D 5
Afghan Ministry Details Pakistani Aid to Counterrevolutionaries D 5
[Kornilov]
Afghan 'Traitors' Admit Training by U.S., PRC Instructors D 6
[(Rashidov)]
Criticism of U.S., PRC 'Interference' D 7
Pushtu Leader Cited on Soviet 'Disinterested Aid' D 8
[Biryukov]
New Afghan Regime Seeks To Reassure Religious Believers D 9
[Bazilyevich]
Foreign Press Cited on Afghan People's Support for Government D 10
Pakistani Economy Experiencing 'Hard Time', Agricultural Problems D 11
Brezhnev, Kosygin Send Congratulations to Indira Gandhi D 12
[PRAVDA 11 Jan]
Preliminary Results of Elections D 12
[Shurygin in PRAVDA 10 Jan]
Indian CP Statement D 13
Indira Gandhi Shows Concern Over U.S. Arms Proposal D 14

WESTERN EUROPE

Marchais Discusses World Situation, Afghanistan G 1
Departure from USSR G 2
UK Envoy in Kabul Recalled To Work Out 'Harsher Policy' G 2

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Commentator Says Soviets Will Not Allow Iran Sanctions H 1
Possibility of Aid H 2
[Bogota Cadena Radial Super] H 2
Iranian Oil Minister Warns Against Support For U.S. H 2
Students Meet With Khomeyni, Explain Need for Laingen H 2
Khomeyni Speech, Incidents in Tabriz Reported H 2
Khomeyni Attacks Call for Islamic Conference on Afghanistan H 3
Karmal Remarks on Afghan-Arab 'Fraternal Relations' H 3
As-Sadat Involved in 'Conspiracies' Against Afghanistan H 3
Kutakhov, Other Military Leaders Attend Iraqi Reception H 4

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

USSR Aid to Nigeria Recalled, Compared to Afghan Situation J 1
[Mikhaylov]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Brazil, Argentina Refuse to Join U.S. Boycott Against USSR K 1
Argentinian Foreign Ministry Statement K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Reasons for Muslim Religious 'Survivals' Analyzed R 1
[Dzabbarov in PRAVDA VOSTOKA 20 Dec]
Chakovskiy Counters Charges of 'Split' in Soviet Literature R 2
[PRAVDA 26 Dec]
Buryatiya Conflict Results in Party Expulsion, Reprimands R 7
[PRAVDA 29 Dec]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Radio Reports Agricultural Developments for 9 January T 1
Agriculture Official Discusses Livestock Wintering T 1
[Kozhevnikov]

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD132000 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Vsevolod Shishkovskiy, all-union radio commentator; Vladimir Konstantinovich Katin, APN political observer; and Vladimir Borisovich Lomeyko, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA observer]

[Text] [Shishkovskiy] The answers which Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, gave to questions from a PRAVADA correspondent have been received with great attention abroad.

Brezhnev Interview

Evaluating the present international situation Comrade Brezhnev emphasized that our party's consistent and creative pursuit of the course of peace, detente and disarmament, and for the implementation the peace program put forward by the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses, has made it possible to achieve much. Speaking broadly, the main accomplishment was to break the tragic circle--world war, then a brief spell of peace, followed by another world war.

However, at the junction of the 1970's and 1980's, the international situation has deteriorated noticeably, Comrade Brezhnev said. It is imperialist circles--and primarily certain circles in the United States--who are to blame for this. The leading circles of the United States and certain other NATO countries have embarked on a course that is hostile to the cause of detente--a course that will produce new spirals in the arms race and lead to an escalation of the danger of war.

The militaristic tendencies of U.S. policies have found expression recently in the pushing through of new long-term arms programs, in the creation of new military bases far beyond the confines of the United States--including the Middle East and the Indian Ocean area--and also in the formation of the so-called quick reaction corps, an instrument of the policy of military interference.

It was the United States, Comrade Brezhnev stressed, who foisted on its NATO allies the decision to deploy new medium-range nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries, something that will lead to a new spiral in the arms race.

Today the opponents of peace and detente are seeking to speculate on the events in Afghanistan. The unceasing armed intervention and the well advanced plot by the external forces of reaction created a real threat that Afghanistan might lose its independence and be turned into an imperialist military bridgehead on the southern border of the Soviet Union. In other words, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev declared, the time came when we could no longer refrain from responding to the request by the Afghan Government. To do other wise would have meant leaving Afghanistan to become a victim of imperialism.

Comrade Brezhnev said the allegations that the Soviet Union allegedly has some expansionist plans with regard to Pakistan, Iran or some other countries of that area are absolutely false. The examination of the so-called Afghan question at the United Nations in spite of objections by the Afghan Government he qualified as a crude flouting of the sovereign rights of the state of Afghanistan.

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev stated that the U.S. administration's decision to freeze the SALT II treaty, its refusal to deliver a whole range of commodities including grain to the USSR, and its termination of talks on a number of questions pertaining to bilateral relations testify to the fact that Washington is once again trying to speak with us in the language of the cold war.

Naturally, we will manage without these or those ties with the United States, Leonid Ilich emphasized. However, the fact that Washington arbitrarily conferred on itself sort of right to reward or to punish independent sovereign states raises a question of principle. Through such actions the U.S. Government is in effect dealing a blow to the international legal system of relations between states.

In answer to a question on the prospects for the development of the situation in Europe, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev noted that the basic interests of the European peoples are inseparably tied to detente. Detente in Europe is needed by the Western states and also the United States no less than it is needed by the socialist countries and the Soviet Union. We are resolute supporters of consolidating and multiplying everything positive that has been created over the years on the European Continent through the collective efforts of states, both big and small. We are for talks but for honest and equal talks which observe the principle of equal security.

Our Leninist foreign policy course is unshakeable. This course combines consistent love for peace with a firm rebuff to aggression. No one will knock us off our course, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev stressed.

Marchais Visit

The talks which recently took place between a delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Comrade Brezhnev and a delegation of the French Communist Party headed by George Marchais, its general secretary, attracted great attention from the world public. These talks are of very great significance with regard to strengthening the fraternal ties between the two parties. I would like you, Vladimir Konstantinovich, to dwell in greater detail on this question.

[Katin] I would like to note the fact that in the course of these talks a wide range of questions was discussed. The joint communique reveals a unanimity of views on these questions. In reading this document it becomes apparent that particular attention was devoted to the problems of disarmament, the consolidation of detente and to the support of the peoples' struggle for liberation. In the view of the Soviet and French communists, there presently exist a number of opportunities to end the arms race, and they will continue the struggle to achieve this great goal. This struggle represents one of the most important directions of their activities. In this perspective the ratification of the SALT II agreement would be an important step, the communique notes. Political detente must be supplemented by military detente and both parties are putting forward specific and realistic measures in that direction.

On the whole, relations between the Soviet Union and France have always been a very important factor in world politics. In the present era, these relations of cooperation and friendship are being preserved and are continuing to develop. This is a positive and important factor.

As the communique notes, however, it must be stated that not all existing opportunities are being utilized. Furthermore, a propaganda campaign aimed at hampering the development of French-Soviet cooperation is being pursued in France. This is contrary to the interests of the two peoples. This is why both parties support and will continue to support the development of more dynamic and balanced cooperation between the USSR and France in the political, economic, technical and cultural spheres--by this I mean cooperation on a long-term basis.

Erratic Carter Policies

[Shishkovskiy] It has been a long time, I think, since a new year began with such stormy upheavals in the political atmosphere. The barometer needle quivers and stable weather is not promised.

One has the impression that we are having a head-on collision between a cyclone and an anti-cyclone. Yet however appropriate the analogy between atmospheric changes and politics may be, this actually is the case. The mass of warm air of detente has clashed with powerful cold war currents. The turbulence in the world's political climate is all the more significant in that it has embraced an enormous region including the Near and Middle East, south and West Europe, America and China. Vladimir Borisovich, what is currently determining the climate of world politics?

[Lomeyko] At the moment the world is witnessing a broad and massive offensive on detente which has been launched by the most barefaced chauvinistic circles in the United States. Together with their old allies from the NATO guard, and their untrained but zealous new recruits from China, they are hastening to deal detente a blow below the belt in order to remove it completely from the arena of political struggle. They are fond of the methods of 11 catch-as-catch-can, a form of American wrestling without rules where any move is permissible, even biting. Strange as it may be, the tone is being set here by Jimmy Carter, the presidential candidate.

[Shishkovskiy] Why do you say candidate, Vladimir Borisovich?

[Lomeyko] Because all his present vagaries in policy bear the mark of a candidate who is fighting for the White House rather than that of a President already installed there.

Many observers, both in the West and in the East, have noted Carter's surprising metamorphoses and transformations. Carter does today what he promised not to do yeaterday--a sign of the changes that are making the weather--and not only in the United States but in many other parts of the world, too. For instance, the Carter who stood as a presidential candidate 3 years ago promised to reduce the arms race. Yet in these 3 years he has already gone down in American history, as many U.S. observers note, as the only U.S. President in the post-war years to have increased the military budget annually. He has adopted a military program--his own brand, as it were--of a militarist 5-year plan. To him also belong persistent efforts to organize pressure on his West European allies to deploy American missiles on their territory.

[Katin] Excuse me, Vladimir Borisovich. I should like to say a word or two about missiles in West Europe. It is now possible to draw up some sort of balance sheet of reactions to these U.S. plans. The fact is that in Europe and beyond--throughout the world, one may say--these NATO plans are arousing protests; for people understand that they pose a serious danger not only to Europe--although in general, of course, it is precisely on the doorstep of the West Europeans that the mine is being laid. Indeed, in Europe now, literally before our very eyes, an explosive zone of heightened military confrontation is being created. Here in Europe, we already have a pretty serious armed confrontation between East and West. When a further 572 strategic missiles are added, the degree of tension, in my view, will increase in proportion to their number. It shouldn't be forgotten that the Soviet Union will not sit back and watch while military preparations are expanded next to its western borders.

[Lomeyko] I would like to continue the analysis of the actions, or, rather, changes in the policy of the U.S. administration that have brought about a state of imbalance, of a lack of equilibrium, of incalculability in Carter's policy, and which are arousing a growing wave of criticism on the part of the international public. Indeed, if we compare what Carter promised to do with what he is now doing, we can say this: Carter promised not to use grain as a political weapon; he is now doing so. It's true that, even according to the assessment of the Americans themselves, he's hurting his own people far more, and the American farmers are indignant. Ah, but that's another question. We're talking now about principles.

Carter was in favor of the demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, and talks on this subject were held, as you know, with the Soviet Union. Now, he is sending American warships there from all over the world. It won't surprise me if they soon start colliding with each other through haste and overcrowding.

Carter was against increasing military supplies to crisis areas. Now, he is intensifying supplies of arms to just those areas--in particular, to Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. Somalia, the Sudan and other countries, as observers note, are next on the list.

[Shishkovskiy] But here we can assume that the American administration has never acted aboveboard. This is especially true if we take into account the fact that there are many indications of possible work on nuclear weapons in Israel, the Republic of South Africa and other countries that are close allies of the United States.

[Lomeyko] True. But Washington is now going against its previous line. Carter once warned against linking events in the Third World with measures to control armaments. But now? In response to the events in Afghanistan, he made a dramatic gesture. He renounced the SALT II treaty, which, by the way, was his baby, and which, as they say in America, he himself christened last summer in Vienna.

But if SALT II, like SALT I, which was born in 1972, can really be called a child of detente, the events in Afghanistan have a quite different destiny, and they are the objective result of the historic process of sociopolitical transformations in the world which, incidentally, have taken place and will continue to take place, at all times and in all political climates.

Events in Afghanistan

[Shishkovskiy] The campaign of hysteria over the events in Afghanistan that has now been mounted in the United States and other Western countries has several aims. Carter personally needs it in order, by going over to the side of the powerful military-industrial complex, to put himself back in the White House, with its help, for a second term. Meanwhile, the Pentagon, and the arms manufacturers, and also all those who share their views or are dependent on their influence, need all the hue and cry over "Soviet interference" and the "Soviet danger" to justify a new round of the arms race and to step up the American presence in the oil regions and the approaches to them.

Vladimir Konstantinovich, what can you tell us about this hullabaloo that has been stirred up in connection with the events in Afghanistan?

[Katin] Yes, a lot of noise is presently being made in the West over the events in Afghanistan. What has happened there? A revolution is no parlor game: It is born in agony and blood. The April revolution of 1978 in Afghanistan overthrew President Daud. Then, in August 1978, a coup took place. In September 1979 there was a second, and at the end of the year, a third. Such are the vicissitudes and stresses that fall to a country where there exist remnants of feudalism, illiteracy and poverty. But the main thing, in my view, are that the people of Afghanistan, and its present leaders, are making a vigorous attempt to emerge from the Middle Ages into the modern world--in other words, the country is seeking its own path of development by putting its stake on a socialist orientation and socialist reforms. No one can deprive the people of the right to such a search--the right to a free choice of their own destiny.

Yet, there are facts that reveal a massed sabotage campaign mounted and subsidized by the United States against Afghanistan, especially during the last 18 months.

Armed provocations from the territory of Pakistan had reached a point where they amounted in effect, to an undeclared war--a silent intervention. It is known, for example, that just recently an operation to land paratroops in Kabul was even being prepared, with the object of, by one rapid stroke, cutting the throat of the April revolution.

There is evidence that the American services have especially stepped up their subversive work against Afghanistan since their failure in Iran. As you know, the U.S. military bases there have been abolished--bases from which espionage activities against the Soviet Union were conducted. In view of the considerable length of the Soviet-Afghan border, the United States with Chinese participation, would not have objected to getting its hands on Afghanistan, and thereby making up for the loss of Iran. It is evidently for this reason that the United States is so furious that those plans have fallen through.

Incidentally, the Soviet Union has never concealed the fact that it will not permit the thransformation of Afghanistan into a bridgehead for the preparation of aggression against itself. Things were going in precisely that direction.

As is well known, the Soviet Union has nevertheless only responded to the pressing request of the Afghan Government for urgent assistance in repelling intervention from abroad. Incidentally, in this action there is absolutely nothing which could seem unexpected. The possibility of precisely such military assistance by the Soviet Union was provided for in the treaty of friendship of 5 December 1978, which contains the appropriate article. One wonders why, then, in December 1978 the United States did not raise a hullabaloo over this treaty and its Article 4. After all, state documents are indeed concluded in order to be carried out, are they not?

In general, one forms the view that the United States is using any pretext, in particular the events in Afghanistan, in order to threaten and turn back the process of detente in Europe. Evidently Washington, all its diplomacy, and the CIA have seriously set themselves the goal of restoring the times of Dulles and Eisenhower.

[Shishkovskiy] As Leonid Ilich Brezhnev emphasized in his replies to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent, attempts to talk profusely about the Soviet threat to peace and to act as the upholders of international morality only appear hypocritical on the part of those whose service record contains the dirty war against Vietnam, who did not lift a finger when the Chinese aggressors carried out an armed invasion of Socialist Vietnam, who for decades have maintained a military base on clean soil contrary to the will of its people and government, and who are rattling sabres, threatening a blockade, exerting open military pressure on the revolutionary Iranian people and sending to Iran's shores a naval armada armed with atomic weapons, including a considerable proportion of the United States' aircraft carriers.

[Lomeyko] I would like to say that there is another factor of fundamental importance which explains why the righwing circles of imperialism have become so insolent in their attacks on detente, on the Soviet Union and on developing countries who want to proceed along a path of independence from America. This is the banking on Beijing.

Brown Visit to China

After the long years of turmoil of the Cultural Revolution, during which millions of human destinies were ground into dust--I mention that in passing for Mr Carter, the great champion of human rights--China has emerged into the arena of world politics flying the flag of the 16th NATO power.

A year or 2 ago, some were having a chuckle and others in the West were making taunts about this, but few imagined that in January 1980 Harold Brown, the U.S. secretary of defense, would be holding many hours of talks with Chinese generals and would be inspecting Chinese military units with them.

[Shishkovskiy] Incidentally, Vladimir Borisovich, the whole atmosphere of the visit and several details have smacked of a cheap flirtation by the Pentagon chief with his newly discovered allies.

[Lomeyko] I do not think that any of the journalists, even those accompanying Harold Brown, knows all the details of the American-Chinese talks. Certain agreements, however, have been quite specific and most indicative. For instance, there was a statement by Brown about U.S. readiness to sell China a satellite-tracking station. In this regard, the comments of the two sides are of interest. At first, prior to Brown's visit, the Americans were saying that this station could be used only for peaceful purposes.

Now, after the sides have struck a bargain, the Americans are saying that the station can also be used for military purposes and are meaningfully adding, obviously for effect abroad, that China is, they say, the only country besides Washington's closest allies which has been honored with the trust of receiving such a station. Beijing has said, incidentally, also in purely Chinese fashion, that it does not intend to use the station other than for the designated purpose. What a lot of pretense, hypocrisy and humiliating play-acting for two great powers.

During Brown's visit to China the sides also discussed the events in Afghanistan, in regard to which they have a unified--in fact it could be termed a NATO appraisal. They have agreed to step up aid to the rebels, who are being trained in special camps in the territory of Pakistan and China. Thus, in addition to its own supplies of arms to Pakistan, Washington is opening up an additional channel for military interference in Afghan affairs by prompting China to step up the flow of its arms and Beijing-trained cutthroats into Afghanistan.

[Katin] Excuse me, Vladimir Borisovich, but I would like to add that as the United States and China are drawing ever closer in cooperation on the common basis of hegemonism, many countries of Southeast Asia are uniting and rallying together in order to counter the American-Chinese political duet. I am thinking of the meeting which took place a few days ago in Phnom Penh. The countries of Indochina--Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos--represented by their foreign ministers, issued a communique expressing their solidarity in the face of the intrigues by American imperialists and Beijing hegemonists.

This suggests a great deal. In the course of their meeting, the ministers exchanged information about the situation in their countries. It was noted in particular that the past year was full of very important political events for the three countries. As a result of an uprising by the whole Kampuchean people, that country threw off the hateful and bloody regime of Beijing's proteges. Laos achieved remarkable successes in the construction of its new life. The Vietnamese people marked the past year with an important victory over the Chinese aggressors who encroached on the independence and sovereignty of their republic.

The ministers of the three countries noted that the militant solidarity of the fraternal peoples of Indochina and their strong friendship with the great Soviet Union have permitted a fundamental alteration in the balance of forces in Southeast Asia in favor of independence and social progress.

[Shishkovskiy] I would like to draw the attention of our listeners to a further aspect of the American-Chinese talks, which not only complicate the situation in the Middle East but also alter the balance of strategic forces in the world. I am talking about a broadening of military cooperation between Washington and Beijing.

This has been reported by many foreign observers, including NBC's Beijing correspondent Brown, who bears the same surname as the secretary of defense. Making a toast at a banquet, the American secretary of defense--the dispatch stresses--indicated the need to broaden contacts in the military sphere between China and the United States. The correspondent goes on to stress that for the first time in history an American representative publicly admitted the possibility of a military alliance between the United States and China.

[Lomeyko] The visit to China by U.S. Secretary of Defense Brown and his subsequent lightning visit to Japan serve yet another goal of American policy--the creation of an America-Japan-China alliance directed against the USSR and other socialist countries. These actions are directed at achieving global superiority for the United States in the world arena. For the sake of this goal Washington is also seriously evaluating the possibility of directly participating in the military modernization of China. But who can guarantee in what direction a future China will stride after it has fully flexed its military muscles? In any event, it will then converse with Washington and its allies in a different way--from a position of the new strength which it will have acquired with their aid.

European 'Irritation' With U.S.

[Shishkovskiy] It ought to be emphasized that the imbalance and irresponsibility of the master of the White House, as shown in his latest decisions on postponing ratification of the SALT II treaty and the curtailment of Soviet-American ties, is evoking suppressed but mounting irritation in many countries, and above all in Western Europe. This disagreement will gradually change into resistance to the United States hegemonistic policy.

[Lomeyko] Many experienced politicians in the West are now asking themselves the reasonable question of why they should pay for the preelection struggle in the United States and why other countries should suffer only because one or other group in America is striving for power with a program which probably will afterwards signify nothing? It is worthwhile comparing the splendid mantle of detente Carter sported 3 years ago with his present militarist display. America's high-handed behavior, redoubled by Carter's imbalance, is already too much even for many of America's allies.

[Shishkovskiy] Bonn and Paris, as well as other West European capitals, have let it be understood that they do not intend to participate in a boycott of the Soviet Union. West Europe is also dissatisfied about the delay in the ratification of SALT II, in which it has an interest.

[Lomeyko] I should think so! It is precisely in the countries of West Europe for whom the fruits of detente are perceptible as in no other area of the world, as the press is at the present time noting in virtually--almost all West European countries--no West European capital would want to lose these achievements of detente. All this attests to the fact that Washington has sown the serious seeds of future discored with its allies.

[Shishkovskiy] Our broadcast's time is coming to an end. I thank my colleagues who have been taking part in our program. Until we meet again! All the best to you!

TROYANOVSKIY DEFENDS SOVIET ROLE IN AFGHANISTAN

LD112339 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2110 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, 11 Jan (TASS)--The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the desire of American politicians and the Beijing leaders to artificially heat up the so-called "Afghan question" in order, under this cover, to turn international development backwards, to the times when enmity among peoples and war hysteria were being (?kindled), the permanent USSR representative at the United Nations, Oleg Troyanovskiy, has declared. Speaking today at the session of the UN General Assembly which has had discussion of the "situation in Afghanistan" foisted on it, the Soviet representative stressed that the USSR intends to firmly pursue its course toward peaceful coexistence and relaxation of tension.

Oleg Troyanovskiy noted that from the very first months after the victory of the April revolution, Afghanistan became the object of direct and gross interference on the part of the Western powers and China. They embarked on the implementation of a whole program of supplying arms and money to the counterrevolutionary bands and of training them and sending them in by way of Pakistan.

Fulfilling its duty to the Afghan people in accordance with the treaty of friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation, the Soviet Union sent limited military contingents to their aid to carry out tasks which consist solely in rebuffing the armed interference from other countries.

The Soviet Government has clearly and definitely stated that the USSR fully intends to withdraw its military contingents from the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan's territory, once the reasons which necessitated Afghanistan's request to the Soviet Union and the corresponding Soviet action no longer obtain. It did not intend and does not intend to interfere in questions concerning Afghanistan's state and social system or its domestic and foreign policies. Assertions about the Soviet Union's participation [prichastnost] in the internal affairs in that country are a fabrication and slander from beginning to end.

In his speech the Soviet representative cited numerous testimonies by the Western press about the active participation of American imperialist circles and Chinese hegemonists in subversive activities against the Afghan revolution. These facts indisputably testify to one thing--the existence of direct armed interference from outside in the affairs of Afghanistan. Had there not been such interference then the Afghan Government would not have had to turn to the Soviet Union for military assistance and our country would not have had to grant it.

The USSR representative pointed to the absurdity of the United States' attempts to don the [word indistinct] of the defenders of the small countries together with its allies. "May one ask where the United States and its allies are, when there is talk, either at the United Nations or out of it, about supporting the struggle of peoples for their self-determination and independence, when South African racists kill hundreds of peaceful inhabitants in Zambia, Angola and Mozambique, when the Israeli aggressors bomb Lebanese villages and Palestinian refugee camps? On such occasions the Western powers take the aggressors under their wing and reject any proposals concerning the use of any measures of influence against them." This is understandable since the United States has itself interfered, on more than one occasion, in the affairs of small countries, trying impose its will on them and hampering their self-determination. The facts, concerning the United State's crass interference in the affairs of Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Chile, Nicaragua and many other states, not to speak of the shameful war against the Vietnamese people, will not be erased from the memory of peoples.

As the USSR representative emphasized, the artificially created "Afghan question" is not the reason for the current onslaught by the United States against the policy of peaceful coexistence and its attempts to return the world to the times of the "cold war." It is only an excuse for the justification of that course which American ruling circles are pursuing, not for the first time. Already in 1978 at the request of the United States the NATO countries made the decision on an unprecedented increase in military expenditure and worked out an extensive program of intensive military preparations, designed for a long period of time, almost up to the end of the present century. Only recently, at the end of 1979, the United States foisted onto a number of West European states the decision on the deployment on the territory of the European Continent of new American nuclear missiles. Parallel to this the American Government came forward with a proposal concerning a further major increase in the U.S. military budget. Now the U.S. President has proposed not only to put away into the top drawer the question of the ratification of the SALT II treaty but has also announced the taking of a number of measures on limiting Soviet-American links.

In carrying out a massed attack on detente and in its desire to heat up the international atmosphere, Beijing, which has more than once demonstrated its adherence to the policy of expansion, is trying not to be outdone by the ruling circles of the United States. Suffice it to recall Beijing's support of the antigovernment "movements" in India, Indonesia, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines, the Chinese-Indian conflict of 1962, the pressure on the Mongolian People's Republic and the seizure of the Paracel Islands. It has more than once been pointed out what a heavy responsibility is borne by the Chinese leadership to all mankind for the tragedy of the Kampuchean people and the aggression against Vietnam. Participation in organizing subversion against Afghanistan was the logical continuation of that hegemonistic line.

The Soviet representative resolutely rejected the claims by Washington and Beijing to dictate their will to the people of Afghanistan, enlisting the help of the United Nations. He described these claims as a violation of the sovereign rights of the Afghan people and gross interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

Indian Statement

LD120919 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 12, TASS--India maintains close and friendly relations with the government and the people of Afghanistan. India has a high stake in maintaining security, independence and the non-alignment stand of the traditionally friendly neighbour, said India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations Brajesh Mishra, speaking in the course of the U.N. General Assembly's session which discusses the socalled "question of the situation in Afghanistan", imposed upon it by the United States and China. India cannot be indifferent to attempts of certain external forces to interfere into Afghanistan's internal affairs, to train and arm subversive elements, to instigate them for provoking disorders in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is fully entitled to defend its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, said B. Mishra. The discussion in the General Assembly of the issue, which concerns the right of the government and the people of Afghanistan to defend their sovereignty and independence, by no means promotes restoration of peace in the region, stressed the Indian representative.

Angolan Support

LD120851 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 12, TASS--The U.N. Charter and the norms of international law by no means disallow a sovereign state to approach a friendly country for assistance. Meanwhile, international law has never allowed anybody to train and arm groups of armed bandits, based abroad, for them to be sent into the territory of a sovereign state with a view of committing acts of sabotage and other subversive actions. This has been stated by Angola's Permanent Representative at the United Nations E. de Figeredo, speaking at the session of the U.N. General Assembly which discusses the so-called "Afghan issue", imposed upon it by the United States and China. The community of nations under no circumstances should sanction the sending of Western imperialist powers and their allies of military equipment and finances for the aims of arming and training rebels in order to destabilize the sovereign government and to terrorize the independent people.

Contrary to threats, orchestrated from abroad, the Afghan Government approached the Soviet Union for aid in order to repel an aggression from outside, and this question concerns only the Afghan Government itself, stressed the Angolan representative. The USSR has always been friend and ally of all national liberation movements, all progressive forces fighting against imperialism and neocolonialism.

PDRY, Lao, Bloc Backing

LD131354 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Excerpt] New York, January 13, TASS--A firm rebuff to the attempts of imperialist and hegemonist circles that imposed upon the UN the discussion of so-called 'Afghan question' was issued by Kadir Saleh al-Hamzah, representative of the PDRY at the United Nations. In his speech at the General Assembly's session, he emphasized that the PDRY condemns imperialism's intrigues directed against progressive countries, and the present campaign against Afghanistan, campaign the aim of which is to calumniate the Soviet Union's support to the Afghan people.

B. Suthichak, representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos, said the discussion of so-called "Afghan question" at the United Nations Organization is unlawful, since the question is exclusively within the competence of Afghanistan--a sovereign U.N. member-state. The events in Afghanistan again showed that imperialism and reaction try to regain their positions in Asia, Africa and Latin America at all costs. The delegate of Laos pointed out that the Soviet assistance to Afghanistan in repelling the outside interference fully conforms to the provisions of the U.N. Charter.

A deep satisfaction with the fraternal assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to the Afghan revolution, was expressed by B. Dashtseren, permanent representative of the Mongolian People's Republic at the United Nations. In the course of its history, he said, the Mongolian people has more than once fallen victim to imperialist and reactionary forces' encroachments but succeeded in defending the gains of the revolution due to the backing of our nearest ally--the Soviet Union. The slanderous campaign which was unleashed by some Western countries and Beijing hegemonists will not make the Afghan people swerve off the road chosen by them. The campaign can only lead to a growth of tension in the world and to revival of cold war.

I. Hollai, representative of Hungary, described the hullabaloo around the events in Afghanistan as imperialism's and reaction's attempt to drive a wedge between socialist and non-aligned countries, Islamic ones, in the first place. To those who if only slightly know contemporary history, such attempts cannot but seem ridiculous, he said.

QOTBZADEH LETTER TO WALDHEIM ON IRAN'S POSITIONS

LD140554 Moscow TASS in English 0550 GMT 14 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 14, TASS--The Security Council discussed the United States' demand for economic sanctions against Iran in connection with the holding of American diplomats in Tehran. According to political observers, this demand is an integral part of the rude political and economic pressure which has been put by the United States on Iran in recent months. Advancing this question at the Security Council, the American diplomacy was obviously trying to involve the international community into its policy of pressure and threats with regard to Tehran.

USSR Permanent Representative at the United Nations Oleg Troyanovskiy said that the USSR has come and comes out for the need to respect international treaties and agreements, including the appropriate international convention on diplomatic immunities. At the same time, it is not rightful to assert that Iran's actions create a threat to international peace and security. What is taking place between the United States and Iran is a bilateral issue. Implication of the question of sanctions into this issue is ungrounded. The use of sanctions, some physical actions with regard to Iran could only aggravate the situation and create a threat to peace. The draft resolution on sanctions proposed by the American delegation has not been adopted at the Security Council since the Soviet Union, permanent member of the Council, was against it.

USSR VETOES UN SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN

LD131159 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 13, TASS--The U.N. Security Council held closed-door consultations in connection with the U.S. demand for economic sanctions against Iran.

During the consultations the Security Council members were informed of the message from S. Qotbzadeh, Iranian minister of foreign affairs, to U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim. The message sets out Iran's positions concerning the U.S. attempts to impose on the UNO the introduction of economic sanctions against Iran. The message, as is reported, proposes that the UNO support Iran's demands for the extradition of the shah and recognize the lawfullness of the demands for the return to the Iranian people of the means that had been plundered by the shah and his family and taken abroad, to the USA, in the first place. During the consultations it was moved that Kurt Waldheim request the Iranian authorities to give further explanations of their stand. It was decided to continue consultations tonight.

MINISTER DENIES FISHING VESSELS ENGAGE IN ESPIONAGE

LD111109 Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 2 Jan 80 p 33 LD

[Ismael Lopez Munoz interview in Moscow with Soviet Minister of Fish Industry Vladimir Kamentsev: "Experience of Sovhispan, despite initial reservations, has been very positive for everybody"--date not specified]

[Excerpt] Question: According to reports published in Spain, the USSR fishing fleet does not confine its activity solely to what we might term "professional" aims, but also carries out, in journalistic language, "espionage activities."

The Soviet vessels fishing in the Mediterranean and off the coast of West Africa are accused, in particular, of permanently monitoring the Western countries' naval forces by means of powerful technical equipment. What can you say about this "special" role of your fleet?

"Let Them Visit Our Vessels"

Answer: That is untrue. We do not and will not have a role of that kind. With respect to those reports, we have witnessed how reports, which are always eventually disproved by reality but whose aim is to blacken our country and its international policy, are falsified in the West. The "facts" which are being discussed not only in your country but also in others are worth less than the paper on which they are printed. To insure that you are in no doubt, I invite all Spanish journalists who so desire to visit our vessels and establish whether or not there are special radar systems. I ask them to take advantage of this opportunity. That is my only reply. It need not be a specific vessel. They can choose from among the entire fishing fleet, live with the seamen for days, investigate freely and then "seek" the reason for the accusations.

Question: What role is played by the Soviet fishing base in the Canary Islands?

Answer: Excuse me, I believe that your question is not framed correctly, because you use the world "base." The Canary Islands' geographical position makes them an important place for vessels from throughout the world. In Las Palmas and Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Soviet fishing vessels and those of other nationalities can meet all their needs--for water, fuel, food, repairs, equipment and also the relaxation necessary for our fishermen. In our case, all this is arranged by Sovhispan, which maintains every kind of relations, and this provides work for many Spanish people, who thus find one of the current problems of your country's economy--unemployment--resolved. But let it be quite clearly understood that it cannot be regarded as a "base." The great majority of the workers are Spanish, and I assure you that the number of Soviet experts there is minimal and, of course, essential for what is entailed by technical work in connection with the fishing vessels.

Agreement with Guinea

Question: The new government of Equatorial Guinea recently denounced its fisheries agreement with the USSR. In addition, there is a tense situation between Spain and Morocco concerning the issue of fisheries and territorial waters. What is your opinion concerning a possible connection between the two situations?

Answer: The cooperation with Equatorial Guinea was mutually beneficial for both countries from the economic viewpoint and from that of technical cooperation, ranging from the supplying of fish to the scientific research conducted there. I must say that it was a cooperation which was more beneficial for Equatorial Guinea than for ourselves. I know that new technical and economic teams are currently studying this, and it is not ruled out that the former cooperation will continue. It is possible that this cooperation will be achieved through our Spanish friends, who will help to renew the agreement. The fisheries issue between Spain and Morocco is a matter for the two countries, and I have no right to comment on the situation.

BREZHNEV SCORES ADMINISTRATION STEPS, ACTIONS IN WORLD

LD141101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Text] Question: Leonid Ilich, how do you evaluate the present international situation, especially in the light of the American administration's latest steps?

Answer: The consistent and creative pursuance by our party of the course of peace, detente and disarmament, of implementing the peace program, set forth by 24th and 25th congresses of the CPSU, has made it possible to achieve much. Broadly speaking, the main accomplishment is that we have succeeded in breaking the tragic cycle: world war--brief spell of peace--world war again. We, the Soviet people, our friends--the peoples of fraternal socialist countries, all those who have struggled and continue to struggle for peace, for detente, for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems have a right to be proud of this historic result.

The situation, unfortunately, has noticeably deteriorated at the junction of the 1970's and the 1980's. The peoples must know the truth about who is responsible for this. I answer without any reservations--the imperialist forces, and primarily specific circles in the United States, are to blame for this. The blame is on all those who see in relaxation of tension an obstacle to their aggressive plans, to whipping up militaristic psychosis, to interference in the internal affairs of other peoples. The blame is on those who have a deeply ingrained habit of behaving in a cavalier manner with other states, of acting in the international arena in a way as though they can do everything.

It has been clear for some time already that the leading circles of the United States and of some other NATO countries have embarked on a course hostile to the cause of detente, a course of spiralling the arms race and leading to a growth of the war danger. The beginning of this was laid already in 1978, at the May session of the NATO Council in Washington where the automatic growth of the military budgets of NATO member-countries till the end of the 20th century was approved. Lately, militaristic tendencies in U.S. policy are found in the acceleration of new long-term arms programs, in the creation of new military bases far beyond the United States, including the Middle East and the Indian Ocean areas and in the forming of the so-called "quick reaction corps," this instrument of the policy of military interference.

Now take such an important document as the SALT II treaty. Its implementation would have opened the way to major steps in disarmament. As is known, this treaty received support in the whole world, including the NATO allies of the United States, and in broad circles of the international public. What did the Carter administration do with it? Hardly was the treaty signed when people in the United States began discrediting it. As to the process of ratification, the opponents of the treaty--not without the connivance of government cifcles in the United States--actually began using it to complicate the treaty's ratification. By his recent decision to freeze indefinitely the debate on the SALT II treaty in the Senate President Carter added one more touch to this unseemly process.

It was the United States that in December 1979 forced on its NATO allies the decision to deploy in a number of West European countries new medium-range nuclear-missiles arms, this leading to a new spiral of the arms race.

Washington virtually muzzled those of its allies who were inclined to positively respond to the Soviet Union's constructive proposals to hold talks on this matter.

Today the opponents of peace and detente are trying to speculate on the events in Afghanistan. Mountains of lies are being built up around these events and a shameless anti-Soviet campaign is being mounted. What has really happened in Afghanistan?

A revolution took place there in April 1978. The Afghan people took its destiny into its hands and embarked on the road of independence and freedom. As it has always been in history, the forces of the past ganged up against the revolution. The people of Afghanistan, of course, could have coped with them itself. But from the very first days of the revolution it encountered an external aggression, rude interference from outside in its internal affairs.

Thousands and tens of thousands of insurgents, armed and trained abroad, whole armed units were sent into Afghanistan territory. In effect, imperialism together with its accomplices launched an undeclared war against revolutionary Afghanistan.

Afghanistan persistently demanded an end to the aggression, that it be allowed to build its new life in peace. Resisting the external aggression, the Afghan leadership, already under President Taraki and then later, had repeatedly asked the Soviet Union for assistance. On our part we warned those concerned that if the aggression was not stopped we would not abandon the Afghan people at a time of trial. As is known, we stand by what we say.

The actions of the aggressors against Afghanistan were assisted by Amin who, on seizing power, launched cruel repressions against broad segments of the Afghan society, against party and military cadres, against representatives of the intelligentsia and the Muslim clergy, that is exactly against those segments on which the April revolution relied. The people under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party headed by Babrak Karmal rose against this Amin tyranny and put an end to it. Now in Washington and some other capitals they are mourning over Amin. This exposes their hypocrisy with particular clarity. Where were these mourners when Amin was conducting his mass repressions, when he forcibly removed and unlawfully physically exterminated Taraki, the founder of the new Afghan state?

The unceasing armed intervention, the well advanced plot by external forces of reaction created the real threat that Afghanistan would lose its independence and be turned into an imperialist military bridgehead on our southern border. In other words, the time came when we no longer could fail to respond to the request of the government of friendly Afghanistan. To have acted otherwise would have meant leaving Afghanistan a prey to imperialism, allowing the aggressive forces to repeat in that country what they had succeeded in doing, for instance, in Chile where the people's freedom was drowned in blood. To act otherwise would have meant to watch passively the origination on our southern border of a seat of serious danger to the security of the Soviet state.

When making the request to us, Afghanistan proceeded from clear-cut provisions of the treaty of friendship, good neighbourhood and cooperation, concluded by Afghanistan with the USSR in December 1978, on the right of each state, in accordance with the UN Charter, to individual or collective self-defense, a right that other states have exercised more than once.

It was no simple decision for us to send Soviet military contingents to Afghanistan. But the party's Central Committee and the Soviet Government acted in full awareness of their responsibility and took into account the entire total of circumstances. The only task set to the Soviet contingents is to assist the Afghans in repulsing the aggression from outside. They will be fully withdrawn from Afghanistan once the causes that made the Afghan leadership request their introduction disappear.

Imperialist and Beijing propaganda deliberately and unscrupulously distort the Soviet Union's role in the Afghan affairs.

It goes without saying that there has been no Soviet "intervention" or "aggression" at all. There is another thing: We are helping the new Afghanistan at its government's request to defend the national independence, freedom and honor of its country from armed aggressive actions from outside.

The national interests or security of the United States of America and other states are not affected in any way by Afghanistan. All attempts to portray matters otherwise are sheer nonsense. These attempts are being made with ill intentions, with the aim of more easily fulfilling their own imperialist plans.

Also absolutely false are the allegations that the Soviet Union has some expansionist plans in respect of Pakistan, Iran or other countries of that area. The policy and psychology of colonialists is alien to us. We are not coveting the lands or wealth of others. It is the colonialists who are attracted by the smell of oil.

Outright hypocritical are the attempts to talk at length about the "Soviet threat to peace" and to pose as observers of international morals by those whose record includes the "dirty war" against Vietnam, those who did not lift a finger when the Chinese aggressors made their armed intrusion into Socialist Vietnam, those who for decades have kept a military base on Cuban soil contrary to the will of its people and government, those who are engaged in sabre-rattling, those who threaten imposition of a blockade and are exerting open military pressure on the revolutionary Iranian people by sending to the shores of Iran a naval armada armed with atomic weapons and including a considerable part of the U.S. carrier force.

A last point must be made in this connection. Interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan is really taking place, and even such an august and respected institution as the United Nations, is being used for this. Indeed, can the discussion of the so-called "Afghan question" at the United Nations contrary to objections by the Government of Afghanistan be described as other than a rude flouting of the sovereign rights of the Afghan state?

The Afghan Government and its responsible representative in the United Nations state for all to hear: Leave us alone, the Soviet military contingents were brought in at our request and in accordance with the Soviet-Afghan treaty and Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Meantime under the cover of the clamor assistance is being increased to those elements that are intruding into Afghanistan and perpetrating aggressive actions against the legitimate government. The White House recently openly announced its decision to expand the supply to these elements of military equipment and everything necessary for hostile activities. The Western press reports that during his talks in Beijing the U.S. defense secretary colluded with the Chinese leadership on the coordination of such actions.

Concluding the Afghan theme it must be said that there is nothing surprising in the hostile reaction of imperialist forces to the events in Afghanistan. The crux of the matter is that the card on which the imperialists and their accomplices had counted was trumped.

In short, the events in Afghanistan are not the true cause of the present complication of the international situation. If there were no Afghanistan certain circles in the United States, in NATO, would have surely found another pretext to aggravate the world situation.

Finally, the entire sum total of the American administration's steps in connection with the events in Afghanistan--the freezing the SALT II treaty, refusal to deliver to the USSR a number of commodities, including grain, in accordance with some already concluded contracts, the termination of talks with the Soviet Union on a number of questions of bilateral relations, and so on--shows that Washington again, like decades ago, is trying to speak with us in the language of the cold war. In this the Carter administration is displaying contempt for important interstate documents, is disrupting established ties in the field of science, culture and human contacts.

It is difficult even to enumerate the number of treaties, intergovernmental agreements, accords and understandings reached between our two countries on questions of mutual relations in various fields that have been recently arbitrarily and unilaterally violated by the government of President Carter. Of course, we will manage without this or that tie with the United States. In fact, we never sought these ties as some sort of a favor to us, believing that this is a mutually advantageous matter meeting the mutual interests of the peoples of our countries, and first of all in the context of strengthening peace.

But the arrogation by Washington of some sort of a "right" to "reward" or "punish" independent sovereign states raises a question of a principled character. In effect, by such actions the U.S. Government deals a blow at the orderly international law system of relations among states.

As a result of the Carter administration's actions the world is increasingly forming the impression of the United States as an absolutely unreliable partner in interstate ties, as a state whose leadership, prompted by some whim, caprice or emotional outbursts, or by considerations of narrowly understood immediate advantage, is capable at any moment of violating international obligations and canceling signed treaties and agreements. There is hardly any need to explain what a dangerous destabilizing impact this has on the entire international situation, particularly since this is the behavior of the leadership of a big, influential power from which the peoples have the right to expect a well-considered and responsible policy.

But, of course, these actions of the U.S. administration will not inflict on us the damage obviously hoped for by their initiators. The cynical estimates concerning the "worsening" of the food situation in the Soviet Union as a result of the U.S. refusal to sell us grain are based on nonsensical notions about our economic potential.

The Soviet people has sufficient possibilities to live and work calmly, to fulfil its plans, to raise its living standards. In particular, I can assure that the plans of providing Soviet people with bread and bakery products will not be lessened by a single kilogram.

We can regard the actions of the American administration only as a poorly weighed attempt to use the events in Afghanistan for blocking international efforts to lessen the military danger, to strengthen peace, to restrict the arms race, in short to block the attainment of aims in which mankind is vitally interested.

The unilateral measures taken by the United States are tantamount to serious miscalculations in politics. Like a boomerang, they will hit back at their initiators, if not today then tomorrow.

Now if all these sallies against our policy are intended to check our mettle, this means that the experience of history is totally ignored. When the world's first socialist state was born in 1917 our people did not ask anybody's permission. And now, too, it decided itself what its way of life is to be. Imperialism tried to put us to test at the dawn of Soviet Government and everybody remembers what came out of this. The fascist aggressors tried to break us in the bloodiest war ever experienced by mankind. But they suffered a defeat. We were subjected to trials in the years of the cold war when the world was being pushed to the brink, when one international crisis after another was engineered. But then, too, nobody succeeded in making us waver. It is very useful to remember this today.

Question: What, in your opinion, are the prospects of the development of the situation?

Answer: The situation in Europe today is much better than it was, say, in the early 1970's. But of course Washington's latest irresponsible actions are making themselves felt here as well. The United States is not content with just about everything to poison Soviet-American relations. It would also like to spoil the relations of West European countries with the Soviet Union, relations in which, as is known, many useful things were achieved during the past decade. The United States is trying to undermine the spirit and essence of the Helsinki Final Act which has become a recognized milestone in strengthening security and developing peaceful cooperation in the continent. Last but not least, by its steps directed at aggravating the international situation Washington pursues the aim of subduing the European states, first of all its own allies.

But the cardinal interests of the European peoples are unbreakably connected with detente. The Europeans have already come to know its beneficial fruits from their own experience. They are inhabitants of a continent that has been singed more than once by devastating wars and they are by no means prepared, and we are convinced of this, to embark on a road of ventures at the bidding of politicians from across the ocean. It is impossible to believe that there are states in Europe that would wish to throw the fruit of detente under the feet of those who are ready to trample it. Western states, and the United States as well, need detente in Europe by no means to a lesser extent than the socialist countries, than the Soviet Union.

Much of a constructive nature can be accomplished in Europe for the good of peace in the near future, in particular, in connection with the forthcoming meeting in Madrid and the proposal by Warsaw Pact countries to hold a conference on military detente and disarmament. We resolutely are for consolidating and multiplying everything positive that has been created over the years in the European Continent through the collective efforts of states, big and small. We will further pursue a policy of peace and friendship between peoples.

In stark contrast to Washington's present extremist position our position is to continue the talks begun in recent years along many directions with the aim of stopping the arms race. This naturally, also applies to problems of lessening military confrontation in Europe.

I repeat: We are for talks, but for honest and equal talks, for observance of the principle of equal security. It is the initiation of exactly such talks that we recently proposed on the question of medium-range nuclear arms. Nobody can expect the Soviet Union to accept NATO's terms designed to conduct talks from positions of strength. The present position of NATO countries makes talks on this problem impossible. We formally told the U.S. Government about all this a number of days ago. We look into the future with optimism. It is a well-founded optimism. We understand that the deliberate aggravation of the international situation by American imperialism is an expression of its displeasure at the consoidation of the positions of socialism, the upsurge of the national-liberation movement, the strengthening of forces coming out for detente and peace. We know that the will of the peoples has cleared through all the obstacles a road for the positive direction in world affairs that is well expressed by the world "detente". This policy has deep roots. It is supported by mighty forces and this policy has every chance remaining the leading tendency in relations between states.

Our people, our country are firmly advancing along the road of communist construction, fulfilling the assignments of the 10th 5-Year Plan, the tasks set by the party. Soviet people and our friends abroad can rest assured that the Leninist foreign policy course is unflagging. It was defined by the decisions of CPSU congresses and is embodied in our entire foreign policy activities. This course combines consistent peaceableness with firm rebuff to aggression. It has justified itself in the past decades and we will adhere to it further. No one will push us off this course.

FURTHER COMMENT ON CARTER'S CUTBACKS IN TRADE TO USSR

Trade Official on Cutbacks

LD130204 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[(Mikhail Taratuta) interview with Boris Borisov, chairman of the Joint Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Borisov answers in Russian with subsequent English translation]

[Text] [Question] Considering that President Carter treats trade as a means of exerting pressure on the Soviet Union, what role would you say does foreign trade play in the Soviet economy?

[Answer] Of course, any contract to supply goods to the Soviet Union increases this country's resources and that undoubtedly benefits the country. But percentagewise the Soviet Union's total foreign trade doesn't exceed 7 percent of its gross production. Foreign trade is therefore a substantial but by no means crucial factor in the Soviet economy.

[Question] Where does the United States rank among the Soviet Union's trading partners?

[Answer] Close to the very bottom of the list among the major Western countries. For example, Federal Germany, Japan and Italy have long left the United States behind in trading with us. America now accounts for barely 2 percent of our foreign trade. Yet, although this figure is insignificant, our purchases in the United States do include such important items as computers and metal-cutting tools.

[Question] Could this qualitative rather than quantitative aspect of the curtailment of trade with the United States effect our economy?

[Answer] Our trade and industrial links with the United States are such that their curtailment cannot be damaging to the Soviet Union in any way. It's not just that we buy so little in the United States; the fact is that practically everything we import from the United States is manufactured by Soviet industry, at times even of a higher quality. Therefore, the departure of the United States from the scene, as one of our trading partners, will have no substantial effect on our economy. All that we will have to do is make certain changes in our plans. That's all. This is confirmed by how we responded to similar situations in the past. When at the advice of President Carter's predecessors Federal Germany refused to sell us large-bore pipes for our pipelines, in a mere 6 months we had commissioned two big plants that more than made up for what we had intended buying in Federal Germany.

[Question] Of course, the Soviet Union is a developed industrial power, as is the United States, for that matter. In this context do you consider that President Carter's measures will be painless for the American economy?

[Answer] Thanks to what is known as the momentum of production the curtailing of trade will not affect the U.S. economy immediately, but after a short time it will definitely make itself felt. First of all, this will affect employment. We estimate that no fewer than 200,000 people are occupied in the industries of the United States working on Soviet orders. Furthermore the curtailment of trade will strike at the manufacturers who have in their warehouses products that were about to be shipped to the Soviet Union. This will immediately hurt quite a number of firms since they will scarcely be able to market these products, many of which are quite specific. If, furthermore, grain sales are suspended, millions of tons of grain will remain in the grain elevators. This will badly hurt the farmers, and even if the government tries to buy up this grain, the farmers' losses will still be considerable since government compensation will not match the prices the Soviet Union was willing to pay. All this, moreover, is bound to hit taxpayers since it is actually they who will have to pay for the unsold grain, just as it is bound to have an adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments.

Of course it can hardly be considered normal that the United States, a major world power, is dropping out as a trading partner of the Soviet Union from any point of view, but the U.S. President has taken this step deliberately ignoring even the damage this will do to the United States itself.

[Question] Considering past and present developments how do you see the outlook for trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States?

[Answer] The American administration's embargo on trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union is undoubtedly a time-serving device. Such a situation can scarcely exist for long. Too many people will suffer from the American Government's zigzaging political course. It seems to me the day is not far distant when it will be felt that the United States has departed from its present course, but it shouldn't be felt that the links now being disrupted in America will be easily or quickly reestablished.

Plan 'To Hoodwink' Farmers

LD122146 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0900 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, 12 Jan, TASS--The U.S. President on Friday announced a measure which, the administration intends, should help overcome the crisis in keeping the United States supplied with petroleum products. This refers to a program for increasing production of gasohol--a motor vehicle fuel which is a mixture of gasoline and grain spirit--within the scope of which it is proposed to boost gasohol output four times over in 1980. This program, calculated for a 10-year period, will cost the American taxpayer $8.5-$13 billion.

However, this White House program is more of a political move than an attempt to establish a real new energy base for the United States.

Its objective is to hoodwink the American farmers who are deeply alarmed by the administration's decision to cut back on grain exports to the Soviet Union and to give them the illusion that the administration intends to help them market a portion of the unsold grain, if only for gasohol production. The political aim of the maneuver by the White House will become clearer if one bears in mind that party caucus elections, which will be very important for the Presidential campaign, are to be held on 21 January in the farming state of Iowa, where President Jimmy Carter will be opposed by Senator Edward Kennedy, who has spoken out against the cutback in grain deliveries to the Soviet Union.

Local observers point out the unreality of this program, since the United States, where only 70 million gallons of ethyl spirit are currently produced annually, has no capacity to raise grain spirit production to 500 million gallons in 1981, which is the target set out by the administration.

Sanctions 'Could Boomerang'

LD121204 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] As you know, the measures announced by President Carter to curtail American-Soviet relations have aroused criticism both in the United States and in other countries. Here is what Radio Moscow news analyst Viktor Glazunov writes on the subject.

The Washington administration's measures are being examined above all in the context of the outlook for the relaxation of international tensions. Above all economic, scientific, technical and cultural links between countries make up what you might call the material fabric of that relaxation. A blow at that fabric strikes a blow at relaxation itself, especially when the relations involved are those between such major powers as the Soviet Union and the United States. But the United States is not just curtailing relations with the Soviet Union. In the American capital it is hoped that this will somehow exert political pressure on the Soviet Union and influence its foreign policy. It need hardly be said how futile such hopes are. Even when the Soviet state was still in its infancy, when it was not as strong as it is today, such methods failed to achieve their purpose. Today this is out of the question. You must remember that Soviet imports from all the industrially developed countries, and not just from the United States, account for a mere 1.5 percent of this country's gross product. Can anyone in Washington seriously think that they can hurt the Soviet Union by canceling this or that Soviet order? I doubt it. What this does accomplish is damage [as heard] American-Soviet relations; that is a fact. And that, evidently, is the real aim of the Washington administration, which has lately clearly tilted in its policy towards the cold war.

Many people in America are now saying that the President's measures could well boomerang back at the United States. For one thing, the canceling of Soviet orders strikes at those in the United States who were planning to fill these orders. In a broader context, this increases distrust of the United States as a business partner. I speak of such distrust increasing because this is not the first time the United States is using economic relations in international affairs as an instrument of pressure. Recall the still not lifted United States blockade of Cuba, or recall how the United States elected to burn several million tons of grain rather than sell them to India at prices that the agro-business monopolies considered unacceptable. Now, I believe that the grain President Carter has decided not to sell the Soviet Union is to be convereted to methanol and to be used as a synthetic fuel. I repeat, this cannot hurt the Soviet Union; even though bad weather made our grain harvest last year smaller than planned we have enough grain both for our own people and to honor our commitments to other countries. But consider the monstrosity of such a fact as grain being burned for the sake of profits, or to further selfish ends: And this at a time when hundreds of millions of people in the world are literally going hungry. And to speak after that of humanitarian ideals, of respect for the individual and of human rights. Politicians in Washington like to quote former presidents. Well, Franklin D. Roosevelt once urged developing the science of human relations, the ability of all nations, without exception, to live together and work toegether in one world and in the conditions of peace. What a striking contrast between that wise ideal and the present policy of the United States.

Pressure on Japan

LD111725 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 11, TASS--TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The newspaper YOMIURI reports that a delegation of the U.S. House of Representatives, now staying in Tokyo, demanded that Japan buy from the USA 17 million tons of grain which was to be delivered to the Soviet Union.

It is not hard to imagine the embarrassment of the Japanese leaders considering the fact that Japan does not need as much grain. Quite recently the Carter administration, talking to Japan in an irritable tones, recommended the Japanese Government to forbid Japanese companies to buy Iranian oil in the free market because the USA is "in conflict" with the present Iranian rulers. Washington did not wish to reckon with the fact that the Japanese economy fully depends on oil imports, including those from Iran, whose oil supplies account for 12 per cent of Japan's overall oil purchases.

Now Japan is being told to buy the grain it does not need. As it is, it has an unsold stock of 6.5 million tons of rice left from the past year. The government is now facing a dilemma: Rice could be sold to the population at low prices, but the monopolies would not agree to this, while a reduction of grain production would hit hard at the Japanese farmers.

People in Japan now ask, and with good reason: Why should the partners and allies of America pay for Washington's foreign policy adventurism and arbitrary actions and for its moves worsening its relations with other countries? Yesterday it made demands concerning oil and for steps to support the depreciated dollar, today it is grain, while tomorrow Washington may draw its allies into still more dangerous ventures.

The main thing for the USA is to assure its own interests, which are dictated to the administration by the military-industrial complex and American monopolies. That is the cost of one's being a partner and ally of the USA.

AUTHORITIES PERPETRATE 'ANOTHER CRUDE PROVOCATION'

LD112358 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2345 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, 12 January, TASS--American authorities have perpetrated yet another crude provocation against the Soviet Union. The administration of Kennedy International Airport, together with the top echelons of the transport workers' union, acting with the knowledge of the U.S. State Department, refused to receive at the airport a Soviet airliner on a regular Aeroflot route between Moscow and New York. The Soviet plane set course for Canada and landed in Montreal.

AFGHANISTAN PART OF 'STRATEGIC ARC' AROUND SOUTHERN USSR

LD141137 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Yevgeniy Shashkov "International Review": "Milestone in the Struggle for Peace"]

[Excerpt] Military force has recently become increasingly prominent as a lever in the latter-day hegemonists' policy. Demonstrations in the style of the notorious "gunboat politics" are talking place in the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean. Having lost its positions in Iran--where there were more than 40,000 U.S. servicemen--after the overthrow of the shah, Washington is now making overt military demonstrations against that country. The United States is trying to involve its NATO allies in its overseas adventures. They are being asked to participate in sanctions against Iran. That is the seamy side of plans to "extend NATO's zone of activity" put forward by the Pentagon.

The example of Afghanistan is also indicative. U.S. imperialist circles together with internal Afghan reaction launched desperate attempts immediately after the 1978 April revolution to push the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan off its chosen path and organize aggressive acts against it from outside. No particular insight is needed to understand the motives behind U.S. actions. There are people in Washington stubbornly seeking to replace the positions lost as a result of the overthrow of the shah's regime in Iran. Flaws were revealed in the notorious "strategic arc" which the Americans have been building for decades close to the USSR's southern borders. They would like to drive the Afghan people and at the same time, the peoples of others countries in the region into the breaches in that arc.

The Afghan Government repeatedly turned to the USSR insistently requesting immediate aid and assistance in the struggle against foreign agression. Our country met the request and sent a limited contingent of troops into Afghanistan. This temporary measure is intended to safeguard Afghanistan against foreign aggression and attempts by internal reaction, led by imperialists, to overthrow the democratic system in Afghanistan and annihilate the April revolution gains.

TRUD DERIDES WEST'S 'HYSTERICAL REACTION' TO AFGHAN EVENTS

LD111301 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Yu. Babich "International Review"--first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Excerpt] Crocodile Tears

What is the explanation for the truly hysterical reaction from the United States and the other Western countries to recent events in Afghanistan?

[Signed] D. Annamuradova, machine operator and driver from the Kommunizm Kolkhoz, Kakhakinskiy Rayon, Ashkhabadskaya Oblast.

The Western powers, and China with them, are indeed trying to use recent events in Afghanistan to fuel another slander campaign against Afghanistan and against the Soviet Union.

They tearfully bemoan the Afghan people's ouster of H. Amin--a stooge of reaction and a CIA agent who overthrew and physically eliminated the country's legal president, N.M. Taraki, founder and leader of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, and annihilated thousands of good Afghan citizens.

They sanctimoniously pretend to the role of some sort of defenders of the "independent Islamic people" and expatiate about some "Soviet invasion of Afghanistan", when they are well aware that the USSR is rendering aid to this country in full accordance with the UN Charter and the 5 December 1978 Soviet-Afghan treaty on friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation.

Contrary to the will of the Afghan people themselves, they obtained the submission of the so-called question of the situation in Afghanistan for discussion by the UN Security Council.

All these "arguments" were also reflected in U.S. President J. Carter's speech on U.S. television 4 January. He again tried to create the false impression that the USSR is pursuing some aims other than rendering aid to Afghanistan in repelling the foreign aggression perpetrated with the direct participation and under the leadership of the United States and China and represented in the Western press as some "movement of Muslim insurgents against the Marxist Kabul regime."

Instead of halting this aggression and thus helping to normalize the situation in this region, the U.S. President has announced that Pakistan, from whose territory the counter-revolutionary gangs are operating, is being allocated major new appropriations intended to encourage incursions onto Afghan territory.

Carter also used the fabrications about the USSR's "aggressive action" in Afghanistan as a pretext for Washington's adoption of a series of unilateral measures aimed at curtailing various ties with the USSR. He confirmed his decision to defer the ratification of the SALT II treaty, announced the reduction of exports of a number of goods, including grain, to the USSR and deferred the implementation of accords already reached in the sphere of cultural, scientific and technical ties.

The crocodile tears of Western and Chinese political intrigues have been provoked by no means by concern for the "welfare of the Afghan people," as they try to assert. They are the result of the failure of plans to turn Afghanistan into an anti-Soviet military bridgehead, a stronghold of the policy of imperialism and reaction in the Middle and Near East region. At the same time they are designed to conceal the attempts by the United States, its allies and China to interfere flagrantly in Afghanistan's internal affairs and to deny it the right to determine for itself the paths of its internal development and the way in which it build its relations with other states.

As for the U.S. administration's measures against the Soviet Union, then--as the TASS statement in connection with U.S. President J. Carter's 4 January television speech emphasizes--"the development of particular ties, like the maintenance of good relations in general between the USSR and the United States, is a reciprocal business. If the White House has conceived the idea of somehow influencing the Soviet Union and its foreign policy, then that is a hopeless undertaking. Such attempts have failed in the past and they will fail now too."

REPORTS ON U.S. MILITARY AID PLANS FOR PAKISTAN

ID131633 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] London, January 13, TASS--The London newspaper SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, referring to information of intelligence circles, reports that Pakistan intends to make an explosion of its first nuclear bomb in the next three months. Intelligence specialists are convinced, the newspaper writes, that Western countries together with China said "O.K." to General Ziaul Haq for the explosion of his atomic bomb. The testimony of this, specifically, the newspaper stresses, is a sharp rise in the size of aid, given by Western countries to Pakistani military leaders, the aid which was earlier limited since Pakistan was engaged in developing nuclear weapons.

Washington, January 13, TASS--Held here have been five hour long negotiations between representatives of the Defence Ministry [as received] and the Foreign Ministry of Pakistan, headed by the President's adviser for foreign affairs Aga Shahi, and senior officials of the U.S. administration, after which President Carter had a 40 minute long meeting with Aga Shahi.

A White House spokesman has characterised that meeting which was also attended by Zbigniew Brzezinski, as rather positive. He emphasized that the President reaffirmed U.S. contractual obligations to Pakistan. The UPI news agency points out that the United States resumed the obligation to help Pakistan with troops and arms, envisaged by the treaty of 1959. Pakistan, the UPI points out, has made it clear that it wants to get from the United States up-to-date fighter-bombers and tanks.

According to a report of a commentator of the American television CBS company, the United States intends to supply Pakistan with up to one billion dollars worth of arms and military equipment.

U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown said today in Tokyo, where he came after a seven-day visit to China, that he was confident that the Chinese would be giving Pakistan aid in different forms, and that the United States now considered the question of giving Pakistan substantial aid, both economic and in the sphere of military equipment sales.

State Department, Foreign Press

LD112240 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, January 11, TASS--Speaking at a press conference here, a high-ranking official of the U.S. State Department reaffirmed the readiness of the United States to provide military aid for Pakistan. It has been already reported that the American administration took a decision to carry out urgent and large-scale arms deliveries to that country including air-to-air missiles, anti-tank guided shells and other weapons for a sum of 150 million dollars. According to a Pentagon spokesman, Pakistan was also offered to prepare lists of weapons it would like to receive. According to the newspaper Washington STAR, the point at issue was related to A-7 combat planes, M-60 tanks and artillery installations.

In other words, the attempts of the American administration to aggravate the situation in the Near and Middle East by supplying arms to Pakistan are obvious. They give rise to serious concern in the countries of that region, including Pakistan itself.

Dwelling on the United States' arms offer, Pakistan ECONOMIST WEEKLY enquires what the United States wants in our region. Does it want to make Pakistan a nut in the global political operations? The world witnessed several times in the past what were the dangerous consequences of these operations.

The newspaper TAAMIR warns that Pakistan should remember that the United States and its Western allies are primarily worried about their own interests.

Noting that in Islamabad they are not in a hurry to use Washington's "bounties", the London TIMES writes that the Pakistanis obviously proceed from their own interests. Such a stand of the authorities enjoys wide support in the country.

Is it not the reason why the Carter administration has intensified its attempts to involve other states to the arming of Pakistan? In this respect it is noteworthy that Britain's Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington is making a trip over several countries of the Middle East and South Asia. According to the TIMES, during the secretary's stay in Pakistan the agenda of the negotiations will probably include a question of arms deliveries.

According to information of the well-informed circles in Islamabad, the United States notified the Pakistan Government that in the course of the visit to China by U.S. Defence Secretary Brown he discussed a question of increasing arms deliveries to Pakistan via China. According to information of the same circles, China is already sending weapons to Pakistan along the Karakorum Highway.

VANCE STATEMENT ON SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN

LD112200 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, January 11, TASS--The United States still considers as the most effective means of pressuring Iran a combination of military force and economic sanctions. The U.S. State Secretary Cyrus Vance, in a television interview, questioned as to whether he excluded the possibility of a U.S. naval blockade against Iran (?stated that he) did not exclude that possibility.

At the same time Vance confirmed that the United States will introduce a comprehensive economic embargo against Iran even if these measures fail to find support with the international community. In the words of the secretary of state, a naval blockade of Iran is necessary to strengthen the unilateral economic sanctions of the United States against that country.

USSR Opposition to Sanctions

LD121218 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Gennadiy Ariyevich]

[Text] Washington has exerted the maximum efforts in its attempts to get the UN Security Council to introduce severe economic sanctions against Iran. The U.S. draft resolution demands the cessation of all flights to Iran, the freezing of exports and the restriction of banking operations with the Islamic republic. The Soviet UN representative, Troyanovskiy, said in an interview with journalists that the USSR is in favor of solving the crisis by peaceful means, as are many countries. The Soviet Union is against interference in Iranian affairs and will not allow the United States to impose a decision on sanctions against Iran.

Meanwhile, U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, in an interview with the NBC television network, let it be understood that the United States will begin a naval blockade of Iran even if the Security Council does not decide to adopt economic sanctions. He stated that the possibility of such an action has not been excluded.

Washington is feverishly increasing the number of its troops in the Near East. Middleton, the military observer of the New York TIMES, has reported that, according to Pentagon plans, it has been decided to deploy ships from the Mediterranean, and the Pacific and Atlantic oceans to the area. It has been proposed to use airbases on the Azores Islands and bases in Egypt and Israel to transfer fighter-bombers and other military aircraft from the United States.

CARTER ACCUSED OF INCREASING PRESSURE ON IRAN

LD131920 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

["Pressure Upon Iran Growing"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, January 13, TASS--The campaign of blackmail and rough pressure on Iran, being conducted by the administration of U.S. President Carter in all directions--economic, military and diplomatic--is gaining momentum.

It has been announced here that the U.S. Government has again sent to Western Europe Deputy Secretary of State W. Christopher to intensify pressure upon U.S. NATO partners from which Washington demands support for economic sanctions against Iran. Simultaneously, at the U.N. Security Council American representatives, as is noted in the U.N. circles, are stepping up the process of "twisting arms" of such countries as Bangladesh and Philippines in order to have the broadest possible approval for the sanctions.

A particular attention has been paid in Washington lately to the task of involving into the U.S. anti-Iranian strategy Moslem countries the stand of which is regarded in the leading American circles as a serious obstacle to realization of anti-Iranian plans. The unbridled propaganda campaign against the Government of Iran serves, specifically, this purpose.

The signal for that campaign was given by President Carter himself, who, speaking to a group of congressmen, made rough attacks at the government of Ayatollah Khomeyni. He asserted that in Iran there is no really existing government, that the political force in that country is in the hands of the international terrorists.

The natural question is how can the head of state permit himself to make judgment about the leadership of another sovereign country.

These pronouncements of the President, which cannot be qualified otherwise but provocative and instigatory, were picked up immediately at the United Nations by the U.S. representative Donald McHenry.

He pertly said at a press conference for him, you see, it is not clear who actually represents the Tehran authorities.

American political observers qualify such pronouncements as attempts to prepare the world public opinion to admit that any actions, including military, against Iran are permissible and justified.

There is no doubt that preparations for armed punitive operations against Iran are in full swing. President Carter himself repeatedly declared the readiness of the administration to resort to such actions. He emphasized in his speeches that he did not rule out a possibility of adopting "alternative (apart from economic) measures" against Iran. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and other officials spoke in the same vein.

The latest American press reports refute Washington's assertions to the effect that elaboration of plans of a military attack at Iran began only after the seizure of American hostages. But yet in September last year, writes today the newspaper New York DAILY NEWS, at a summit meeting in Washington decision was taken on the build up of the American military presence in the Indian Ocean. About 25 American warships are known to have been concentrated by now in the area of the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. 5 aircraft-carriers were directly drawn to participation in an operation against Iran.

Simultaneously, widely under way is a global redeployment of ships of different naval fleets the aim of which is to ensure their readiness for a possible expansion of military actions against Iran.

Washington's feverish search for new military bases in the Middle East and in Africa serves the same purpose. According to a statement of a Pentagon's representative, the use of such bases in Oman, Somalia and Kenya will be stipulated in detail by a group of experts of the American military department.

U.S. PLANNING MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAN

LD112234 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

["Preparing Reprisals"--TASS headline]

[Text] New York, January 11, TASS--The Pentagon is hastily elaborating different scenarios of punitive operations against Iran. According to military news analyst of New York TIMES D. Middleton, at present, in the light of the Iranian crisis, the officials from the U.S. Department of Defence engaged in the planning of these operations are placing the chief emphasis on the "build-up of sufficient forces" to embark on military operations in the area. In the process the Pentagon plans to use both troops now stationed inside the United States and those deployed in territories of other countries, the author says. The U.S. fleet deployed in the Mediterranean Sea, the Pacific and the Atlantic oceans as well as in the Arabian Sea will provide their combat vessels and aircraft carriers.

Aircraft can be taken from the two airforce armies stationed in the United States which include 43 squadrons of fighters and fighter bombers as well as five tactical reconnaissance squadrons.

To get these forces to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf area the U.S. strategists intend to use airfields in the Azores Islands, bases in Egypt and Israel and in other countries, as well as the military facility in the Diego Garcia Island in the centre of the Indian Ocean.

Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee J. Stennis called on the United States to build without delay a military base in the vicinity of the oil fields of the Middle East. He announced that his committee will, in the near future, hold hearings on the situation in Iran. One of the first to appear before the committee will be U.S. Defence Secretary Harold Brown who will "review military and other actions by the United States and its allies."

'BLATANT INTERFERENCE, DIKTAT' WITH RESPECT TO OTHER COUNTRIES

LD111402 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The United States' policy of blatant interference and diktat with respect to other nations has been condemned by people everywhere. Our observer Leonid Levchenko comments:

Hardly a day passes without Western mass media reporting movements by American naval units in parts of the world separated from the United States by thousands of miles. The ships are carrying nuclear weapons, aircraft and landing troops ready to strike against any regime that does not suit Washington. These days American attention is focused on the Middle and Near East. Political observers link this with growing concern in Washington over the mounting national liberation struggle in the region. As Washington steps up pressure on Iran it is threatening to use military force against that country. A whole armada of American naval ships has been concentrated off Iranian shores. The Pentagon intends to use military bases in Egypt for punitive actions against Iran. According to a spokesman for the State Department, the possibility of America making use of bases on Israeli territory is also being considered.

In short the parties to the Camp David deal have not only found a common language on what they present as a settlement of the Middle East problem, they have also joined forces in a bid to help Washington to promote hegemonistic policies on a much wider scale.

New confirmation of this has emerged from the talks between the Israeli premier and the Egyptian president in Aswan. The Egyptian defense minister has disclosed that air forces of his country and the United States have been conducting joint exercises for several weeks using a big base near Luxor in upper Egypt for the purpose. The American Air Force contingent employed there includes two spy planes equipped with the AWACS warning and control system. The purpose of these flying radars is to guide American naval operations off the Iranian coast.

Meanwhile, Washington has taken more steps to destabilize the situation in Iran, working along political and economic lines as well as misinformation. Attempts are being made to starve provocations the country through a blockade. The CIA in Iran has been organizing provocations to incite a fratricidal war and anti-government actions. The mouthpiece of American foreign policy, the Voice of America, has increased its subversive broadcasts beamed to Iran. In a bid to justify its refusal to settle the crisis in its relations with Iran peacefully, the American administration claims that there is no single government in that country to hold talks with. This claim is as unfounded as it is vicious; it is tantamount to open interference in a country that has lawful institutions of government. This is nothing but hegemonism in action with America assuming the right to do anything it wants on the pretext of defending its interests.

EFFORTS TO SAVE SHAH FROM EXTRADITION NOT ABANDONED

LD1131308 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Panama, January 13, TASS--Official Washington does not abandon attempts to save the former shah of Iran from a just retribution for the monstrous crimes which he had committed against the Iranian people.

According to a report of Panamanian television, with reference to unofficial sources, a plan is being worked out for the shah's departure from Panama, and for his taking refuge in Paraguay where the Stroessner fascist regime could create all necessary conditions for his "security".

The aim of the plan which is being elaborated in strict secrecy is to prevent an extradition of the shah. The elaboration of the plan has been hastened in view of the forthcoming meeting of the U.N. Security Council. There is every indication that the high patrons of the shah-criminal fear that the Security Council may come out for the setting up of an international tribunal for inquiry into the shah's crimes.

At present the Security Council is holding closed door consultations in connection with the message sent to the U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim by S. Qotbzadeh, Iranian minister of foreign affairs. The message is calling on the UNO to support Iran's demands for an extradition of the shah and for the return to the Iranian people of the means that had been plundered by the shah's family and taken abroad.

According to news agencies' report, the Iranian Government sent the Panamanian authorities a warrant for the arrest of the ex-shah of Iran. The warrant points out that the shah is charged with mass killings and tortures of Iranian people. As is pointed out in an accompanying letter from S. Qotbzadeh, Iranian minister of foreign affairs, to Aristides Royo, president of Panama, in accordance with Panamanian laws, the authorities of Panama are obliged to immediately arrest the ex-shah.

WASHINGTON WANTS TO KEEP DETAILS OF SHAH'S REGIME SECRET

LD121804 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 12, TASS--Iran has sent an official request to Panama to arrest the deposed shah of Iran on charges of mass murder, torture and embezzlement of public funds. In a letter to Panamanian President Aristides Royo, Iranian Foreign Minister Sadeq Qotbzadeh stressed that the formal request to extradite "Mr. Mohammad Reza Pahlavi" would follow within 60 days of the shah's arrest by Panamanian authorities.

The crimes of the former monarch during his rule are no secret to any one, including the U.S. ruling circles. Recently, foreign newsmen accredited in the Iranian capital were given an opportunity to visit one of the most terrible prisons of the shah regime, Quasr, in the very centre of Tehran. Victims of the shah terror unleashed by the secret police SAVAK--journalist Reza Dehati, Deputy Minister of National Orientation Mehdi Momken and others spoke of the long years spent in prisons. Not a single questioning session did without beating with clubs and electric cable, tortures by fire and electric shock and "frying" of people in special grilles.

Torturers for SAVAK were trained and instructed by specialists from the CIA. One of the "disciples" of the U S. Central Intelligence Agency invented for the inmates a dreaded torture called "Apollo". A kind of a space helmet was put on the head of the person questioned and his cries, amplified dozens of times, resounded in the brain of the unfortunate victim.

In another of the shah's prisons--Evin--questions of newsmen were answered by former SAVAK member Hasan Sana'i. The relations between SAVAK and the Central Intelligence Agency and the Israeli secret service Mossad went far beyond the framework of simple cooperation, extending to joint planning and conduct of operations, he said. U.S. agents who freely operated in Iran had betrayed to SAVAK many Iranian patriots.

Yesterday in London, President of the Central Bank of Iran Nobari made public a whole number of confidential documents shedding light on, first, corruption among top U.S. administration officials who got luxurious presents from the shah, carpets and valuables, and secondly, on the mechanism of the U.S. patronage to the bloody shah regime. Involved in the unseemly activities were former Vice Presidents Spiro Agnew and Nelson Rockefeller, the latter's brother David who was in charge of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and a number of others.

The shah's regime disposed of the national wealth of the country as his own property. According to some data, the family of the overthrown shah had repatriated from Iran financial means amounting to not less than 25 billion dollars, part of which went to pay for the acquisition of property and deposits into Western, primarily American, banks. Members of the Pahlavi Dynasty were Iran's biggest capitalists--they held stocks in 17 banks and insurance companies, 25 metallurgical enterprises, 8 mining companies, 55 building firms and building materials enterprises, 43 food products companies, 26 major department stores and in all the leading hotels of the country. Many of these assets were owned by the shah's family jointly with U.S. corporations.

All this immense wealth was taken abroad before the victory of the revolution. As the leader of the Iranian revolution Khomeyni stated, the U.S. President J. Carter has declined satisfy the legitimate demands of the Iranian people about the shah's extradition or at least about organizing an international commission to investigate into the shah's crimes because a trial of the shah will bring to light the crimes of the United States in Iran, now kept a secret. The United States wishes to consign these crimes to oblivion.

AFGHAN, IRAN USED AS PRETEXT TO SECURE 'FREE HAND' FOR CIA

LD121315 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0655 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

["A Free Hand for the CIA"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 12 January, TASS--TASS commentator Vadim Biryukov writes:

Someone in Washington has decided to use the failure of the plans of American imperialism in Iran and Afghanistan as a pretext for an attempt to lift the legislative provisions intended to restrict the provocative actions of the U.S. espionage agency. This campaign got under way on Thursday with a report published by "specialists from Georgetown University." The highlights of this publication was the far-reaching conclusion that the controls imposed tie the hands of America's spies, depriving them of the opportunity to work effectively.

The press has been drawn into the campaign in "defense" of the CIA. In a lengthy article the New York TIMES complained of the fact that an excessive number of congressional "agreements" does not give the CIA the opportunity, first, to really develop and, second, to keep its "active operations" secret. The London TIMES has said outright that the restrictions imposed on the CIA have done "great harm to the positions of the West."

Everyone remembers that since 1947 when the CIA was set up congressional committees and other U.S. official bodies have on a host of occasions been forced to devote attention to activities of the espionage department violating the country's Constitution. State coups, killings for political motives, the use of American and foreign journalists for espionage, telephone tapping, the opening of correspondence, secret searches and experiments on human beings constitute a far from full list of CIA crimes, which are well known to the whole world.

In recent years a great deal of effort has been undertaken to create the impression that the present-day American special services are totally different. Numerous reorganizations of the CIA have been undertaken not only to placate the public but also to hide more deeply the illegal operations of the CIA. All this, of course, has been of a window-dressing and cosmetic character, because, despite official "prohibitions," the CIA has still been using unscrupulous and illegal methods.

The facts prove that during the period of the shah's overlordship, the American intelligence services, supported by SAVAK, through bribery, blackmail and the physical elimination of "unsuitable people" defended the interests of American imperialism in that country.

The facts give proof also of the insidious role of the CIA in the organization of counter-revolutionary bands on Pakistan's territory so as to combat people's authority in Afghanistan. It has been established that Amin, in dealing with thousands of Afghans who were faithful to the April revolution, was a CIA agent.

What is Washington trying to achieve in its present campaign of protecting the CIA? On the fact of it, it aspires to liberate the spy service from any kind of control so that it can carry on with its sordid work unhindered.

CORRESPONDENTS REPORT ON CARTER MOVES, ASWAN MEETING

LD130148 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yevgeniy Petko: Foreign correspondents report]

[Text] In his television interview U.S. President Carter, who is now playing the part of producer of the noisy anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan buffoonery in the West, demonstrated his striving to revive the so-called from-position-of-strength policy toward the socialist countries. The American hawks are rejoicing, for they have acquired a new ally. The American President has conceived the idea of exerting pressure on the Soviet Union. He has confirmed his intention of putting off the ratification of the SALT II treaty and has announced a cutback on exports of a number of goods to the USSR, including grain. During the years of Carter's presidency this is not the first attempt to achieve political aims by linking them with matters which have nothing to do with the matter in hand. But this sort of so-called stick-and-carrot policy has cracks in its foundations. Opposition to the President is growing unabatedly within the United States. Listen to what our correspondent in the United States, Vladimir Gerasichev, has to say about this: Over to you.

[Gerasichev] It is quite obvious that the decision of President Carter to put off the ratification of the SALT II treaty runs counter to the will and wishes of the American people, the overwhelming majority of whom--more than 80 percent--supports the ratification of the treaty. Gus Hall, general secretary of the U.S. Communist Party, has called the measures taken by the President a concrete manifestation of the imperialist policy of the U.S. administration directed at undermining the system of socialism.

[Petko] How is the American public reacting to these measures?

[Gerasichev] The decision on cutting exports of a number of American goods to the Soviet Union, including grain, will also hit the interests of the American people: $2.5 billion will have to be paid by the U.S. taxpayers to compensate, if only partially, for the farmers' losses as a result of the ban on grain sales to the Soviet Union. The American agricultural movement organization is planning to stage a protest march on 16 February against the administration's policy directed at infringing the interests of American farmers. (Marvin Mead), chairman of this organization, has reported that thousands of farmers, who intend to tell the President that his decisions might return the country to economic chaos and ruin thousands of farmers, agricultural workers and farm produce traders, are to gather for the demonstration in front of the White House. (Marvin Mead) said that they intend to tell the President that until he changes his attitude towards the farmers he need not count on their votes in the Presidential elections.

[Petko] We cannot view the actions of the American administration as being anything other than a poorly considered attempt to exploit the events in Afghanistan so as to block international efforts aimed at reducing the military threat, at strengthening peace and limiting the arms race. In other words, to block what the whole of mankind is interested in; said Leonid Ilich Brezhnev replying to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent.

The unilateral measures being taken by the United States are serious miscalculations in policy. They will boomerang on their initiators, if not today then tomorrow.

[Gerasichev] Yes, if the President's present policy has become his campaign platform then I would like to note that it is very different from the President's campaign slogans in 1976, and reminds one more of the game of roulette, which is widespread in the United States. In this game bets are put on various colors solely to achieve big wins.

[Petko] One more aspect of Carter's speech concerns the dangerous plans being hatched by those who whipped up the slanderous campaign to distract attention away from the real threat to Afghanistan from outside, from the American threat hanging over Iran, from attempts by the United States to play the role of world policemen. In this respect yet another event of the past week is typical. The ninth meeting in a series which began in the autumn of 1977 has been held in Aswan between the Egyptian President as-Sadat and the Israeli Prime Minister Begin. This dialog, just as previous ones, took place within the framework of the separate deal between Cairo and Tel Aviv. Even before the start of the talks in Aswan the Egyptian president said that great attention at this meeting would be devoted to the Palestinian problem.

In this connection it was recalled that according to the Egyptian-Israeli treaty it is necessary to find an acceptable solution by May 1980 for a formula for so-called administrative autonomy on the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip. Furthermore Egyptian officials claimed that progress in matters concerning the normalization of relations between the two countries depends precisely on this. The results of the Aswan meeting, however, showed that the Palestinian problem is of no concern at all to the Cairo regime. As-Sadat, in Begin's words, told him openly on the last day of the visit: Pay no attention to other statements. Only my statements are valid. At the microphone is our correspondent in the Near East Leonid Rassadin:

[Rassadin] Judging by reports from Aswan (?military) dominated the Egyptian-Israeli meeting. This is understandable, for the present rulers of Cairo and Tel Aviv are united not by adherence to the cause of peace but by fierce hatred toward liberation movements, revolutionary processes, democracy and progress. This is why matters of strategic and military cooperation were discussed during the Aswan talks. [Words indistinct] that is by means of granting Egyptian territory to the United States for basing American Air Force planes there. And if one adds to this the long-standing special relations between Washington and Tel Aviv, then it becomes obvious that this is a question of knocking together, under the aegis of the United States, a fresh military bloc in the Near and Middle East with the participation of Israel and Egypt--an alliance spearheaded against the national liberation forces. It is not by chance that Cairo has already stated its readiness to give every kind of support to the handful of counter-revolutionary fanatics in Afghanistan. In other words the United States is already allotting roles among its allies in the Near East. Egypt will try to take upon itself the functions of a police gendarme particularly in the Persian Gulf and in the adjoining areas and Israel will continue its aggressive operations against the Arabs, above all in southern Lebanon.

In the situation that has come about the progressive Arab public and all Arab patriots are warning of fresh dangerous intrigues by American imperialism, Zionism and reaction in the Near East area.

KOBYSH ATTACK ON BRZEZINSKI INFLUENCE ON U.S. POLICY

LD141135 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 4 LD

[V. Kobysh article: "Concerning an Interview With Z. Brzezinski"]

[Text] Z. Brzezinski, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs, of whom America's WALL STREET JOURNAL wrote recently that "all his 51 years he has been striving for power" and "after almost 3 years of tireless self-publicity now seems to be the man who is guiding U.S. foreign policy," is openly rejoicing. Well known for his extreme anticommunism and morbid anti-Sovietism, Brzezinski regards the Washington administration's actions today as the culmination of the ideas which he was developing back in the academic quiet of Columbia University and as the apotheosis of the "hard" line with regard to the USSR which he outlined.

Well, it is probably possible to agree that the U.S. President's official assistant has grounds for being pleased with the course of things. The "Brzezinski line," which until recently scared many people in the United States with its extremism and fanaticism, has become, as the U.S. administration's recent steps show, Washington's official policy. Everything indicates that it is precisely he and no other who today determines U.S. actions in the world and its foreign policy program.

Intoxication with his own omnipotence evidently account for Brzezinski's statements just published in a TIME magazine interview, which he most likely would hardly have ventured to make at another time. Charging the Soviet Union with having "dealt a big blow to detente with its actions in Afghanistan," the U.S. President's assistant openly declared that he "cannot rule out the possibility of an escalation of the arms race." Replying to a question on the prospects for military cooperation between the United States and China, Brzezinski admitted no less frankly that U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown, who is at present in Beijing, is conferring with the Chinese leaders on precisely this question. Finally, warning that the United States intends to act "very decisively and very energetically," the President's assistant attempts to intimidate the Soviet people.

What, then, does he intimidate them with? Brzezinski does not speak directly on this score in this interview. But in his previous statements he has not concealed the fact that he wants to impose on the Soviet Union an exhausting arms race which would slow down our development and disrupt our economic plans.

At a recent briefing for journalists spokesman for the White House and the U.S. administration, with obvious prompting from Brzezinski, explained as follows Washington's measures aimed at curtailing economic, scientific and technical ties with the Soviet Union and at tearing up the trade contracts already signed with our country: This, the most serious action we can take, not counting starting a war (that, word for word, was what was said!--V.K.), is designed to have adverse consequences for the entire Soviet people by hindering the growth of their prosperity and, in particular, affecting their diet [pitaniye]. As we see, this is something like an economic blockade, a desire to make our people tighten their belts--no more, no less!

This is no longer politics, but something which goes beyond politics. These misanthropic statements conceal a biological fear of the changes which our revolution has brought the world and a hatred of that revolution--a hatred which has persistently been cultivated and fanned in every possible way right from the start, in fact since 1917. Since then attempts have not ceased, either, to bring us to our knees and to strangle us by starvation and various other means. They failed, as is known. Surely Professor Brzezinski does not seriously believe that it will work now?

Brzezinski cites the events in Afghanistan and the aid which the Soviet Union has given that country in repulsing imperialist aggression at its government's request in full accordance with both the Afghan-Soviet treaty of 5 December 1978 and the UN Charter as justification for toughening Washington's policy, escalating the arms race and curtailing Soviet-American cooperation. The President's assistant was quite beside himself at the fact that the Soviet Union had taken actions, as he puts it, "in a region of vital importance to the United States."

This is the logic of imperial thinking. A region many thousands of kilometers distant from America's shores is regarded as "vitally important" for the United States, and therefore the Soviet Union, which has a common border with Afghanistan, must watch indifferently while the United States and also China and certain countries, using Pakistani territory as a base, seek to stifle the Afghan revolution and overthrow the existing people's democratic system in the country. No, the Soviet Union will not observe with indifference reprisals against a friendly neighboring country, whatever imprecations imperialist ideologues might heap on our heads.

The question arises: To what extent do the "logic" of Brzezinski--a man without kith or kin, as the popular saying goes--and the decisions accordingly adopted by the U.S. President on the basis of the "logic" reflect the opinions of U.S. citizens themselves? Knowing Americans, their sentiments and their attitude toward the surrounding world, including toward the people of our country, it is simply impossible to imagine that they would venture even for a moment to think like Brzezinski. It is not their interests but someone else's that are served by a "policy" which is overtly directed against and challenges other peoples.

ADMINISTRATION 'HAS NOT PROVED EQUAL TO GREAT-POWER RESPONSIBILITY'

LD111331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[Correspondent T. Kolesnichenko dispatch: "Story of a 'Slide'"]

[Text] New York--The more furiously American propaganda rages these days and the more it slanders the Soviet Union's policy, the more obvious become the hastiness and baselessness of its arguments and its inability to conceal one irrefutable fact: The measures taken by the White House, which complicate the international situation and are aimed at undermining detente, are not a reaction to recent events in Afghanistan, as people here try to prove, but a logical outcome of the administration's downhill slide and capitulation to the most reactionary U.S. forces.

Unfortunately, the conjectures of the observers who warned that the administration might be driven to dangerous steps by its veering from side to side and--the main thing--its readiness to pay any price and sacrifice any ideals for the sake of retaining the White House in an election year have been vindicated. That is why it is hard to shake off the impression that the direct attack on detente and Soviet-American relations has been mounted not by the U.S. President, but rather by J. Carter--one of the candidates in the 1980 presidential campaign--who has thrown down his latest cards in this vanity fair.

Many observers are drawing attemtion to this fact. James Wechsler bluntly remarks in the New York POST that the President's "dramatic measures" are primarily designed to "paralyze his potential Democratic and Republican rivals." "Firmness," "a sense of leadership" and "determination" are the unfailing descriptions here in commentaries on Carter, which are, above all, conjecture about the additional support he will now obtain from big business connected with military production. However, what shows real firmness is certainly not flirtations with rightwing forces and a morbid reaction to every point in public opinion polls, which are manipulated by the mass media, but a consistent, principled political course. It is precisely this that the administration has lacked (and lacked before). By giving way to reaction step by step, it has ultimately devalued detente's principles and important achievement--SALT II.

New York TIMES observer Tom Wicker lists the "signals" received lately from Washington. "They (the Russians--T.K.) saw the U.S. Senate preparing to reject or table SALT; they heard President Carter promise to sharply increase military spending and announce the creation of special 'quick-reaction forces' capable of reaching any part of the world in a short time; they were angered by the decision of the U.S. NATO allies to accept the plan for developing Pershing and cruise missiles and deploying them on European territory, whence they can reach the Soviet Union."

It is particularly worth dwelling on the SALT issue. The treaty signed last June immediately became the target of attacks from rightwing forces and the U.S. military-industrial complex. And that is understandable. It was not just a question of the military-industrial complex losing military orders worth, according to the most modest calculations, $30 billion. What frightened them still more was the possible development of the subsequent process of limiting strategic arms and curtailing the arms race. Real firmness was needed from the administration under these conditions. At first J. Carter managed to contend to his opponents that SALT was "not a concession to the Russians but a reasonable compromise" and that the treaty was necessary to the United States, just as it was to the Soviet Union. However, these positions were rapidly surrendered. [paragraph continues]

The administration effectively began to play up to rightwing forces by recognizing the theory of the "linkage" of SALT with (that is, its dependence on) the other international problems. This opened the floodgates for the wildest insinuations, such as the artificial problem of the "Soviet military brigade" in Cuba and so forth. Now the slanderous fairy-tale of some kind of "Soviet aggression in Afghanistan" has appeared. And the outcome is that the President who signed SALT is asking Congress to postpone its discussion and a ratification. Although the treaty has not been struck from the Senate's agenda, in fact, it is believed here, the Senate will not discuss it before the end of this year.

The haste and lack of coordination displayed at the highest level over this decision are striking. Only a week ago--after the turn taken by events in Afghanistan--Z. Brzezinski, the President's assistant for national security affairs, noted on television that any U.S. reaction to these events must not affect SALT, because that would disrupt international stability. "We need the SALT treaty still more now than we did before," he said. A few days pass, and it transpires that the SALT II treaty can be manipulated virtually to "punish the Russians!" Obviously what has prevailed is consideration of the election campaign, whose organizers, newspapers note, "have long dreamed of removing SALT from the problems involving confrontation with influential forces of the Senate and the military-industrial complex."

The U.S. NATO allies have been taught a graphic lesson. When Washington was twisting their arms to secure the decision to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles on their territory, it gave the solemn assurance that this was the necessary "price" for the SALT II treaty and the future SALT III talks. It is now clear to everyone what those promises were really worth and at the same time how dangerous and thoughtless it is to blindly trust the Washington siren.

While he has been applauded on the right--by the military-industrial complex and hawkish senators (the New York POST writes: "Carter Grabbed Applause"), the President has caused the American public serious concern. It is no accident that the New York TIMES published a special editorial noting the danger of manipulating SALT II and calling for "the treaty not to be sacrificed" but to be "kept alive." Otherwise what may result, in the newspaper's opinion, is a sharp deterioration in the international situation.

The White House advisers whose recommendations prompted the President to effectively harm the Soviet-American relations achieved through mutual accords also erred. In the atmosphere of anti-Soviet hysteria currently raging this may indeed look to some people like a "show of firmness," but in the long term Washington's decision will inevitably undermine still further, above all, the international prestige of the administration that so thoughtlessly destroys what has been created over the years in the interests of both the American and Soviet peoples, and in the interests of peace and international security.

Moreover, the "sanctions" Carter has announced in the sphere of American-Soviet trade primarily hit U.S. interests. J. White, chairman of the Democratic Party National Committee and a former deputy secretary of agriculture, believes this will cost the United States $5 billion. Although well-known commentator J. Reston joined in the anti-Soviet ballyhoo, he has nevertheless been forced to admit that the result of recent events "will not be the general war over oil resources that we fear, but a more dangerous international situation and a more disunited world with growing military budgets (which already absorb $600 billion per year) and with greater inflation and less hope of getting help for the poorest members of the family of mankind."

The political trick to which the administration has resorted in the last few days has confirmed the suppositions voiced by many observers in connection with the growing dangerousness of the American threat to peace. Hegemonist concepts of American "reaction over the horizon" and interference in the "arc of crisis" region in the name of the notorious U.S. "national and vital interests' have really come into play now. So there is nothing more cynical than the sham "concern" and ballyhoo in the United States over events in Afghanistan.

Look what is happening: Propaganda here proclaims that the United States is interested in strengthening stability in the region of Iran, Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf. Logically, the elimination of tension on Afghanistan's borders and the suppression of operations by the armed formations based in Pakistan that have long been disrupting the DRA's [Democratic Republic of Afghanistan's] peaceful life, creating tension and instability in the region, certainly ought to have been welcomed by Washington. But in reality Washington needs something else. Ridiculing Washington's cynicism, Roger Simon writes derisively in the New York POST: "The Soviets want a stable government in Afghanistan. And what are we--in favor of the Muslim insurgents? and whyever not? When Muslims seize our embassy we call them 'religious fanatics,' but when they are against the Russians we call them 'freedom fighters'.... It is not so long since the State Department declared that these insurgents were growing opium and spreading narcotics throughout the world, including the United States. So is Carter going to defend opium supplies? Whyever not? You must take the global view of everything. In this case they are our opium suppliers, and that's the whole answer."

No, what Washington is concerned about in this region of the world is not stability but how to implement its expansionist geopolitical aspirations. While shedding crocodile tears over "Afghanistan's fate," Washington is stealthily endeavoring to establish itself firmly in the Persian Gulf and Near East. Sites for military bases in Egypt and Israel are being urgently sought. It has been announced that the naval armada of 21 U.S. ships currently in the Arabian Sea will remain there indefinitely. Pakistan will shortly receive 100 A-7 fighters. Nor is it ruled out that a base will be set up on its territory, it has been reported here. It is also reported that new naval bases are being sought in Oman, the Persian Gulf and Somalia. A special place is assigned to China, which is to be the main supply and training base for the Afghan counterrevolutionaries.

Breaking all records for hypocrisy, Washington is trumpeting that its efforts must be directed "toward protecting the independence" of the peoples of the Indian Ocean, central Asia and the Near East. Things have reached the point where the Pentagon--the selfsame Pentagon whose generals only yesterday were devising plans for "dropoing bombs" on Iran--is today declaring its readiness to "defend" that country's interests (?). The selfsame American imperialism that killed millions of people in Vietnam and supports in the United Nations the representative of the bloody Pol Pot regime which killed 3 million people--that imperialism is today swiftly repainting its facade, pretending to be a "friend" of the peoples of Asia and the Near East.

But history and the peoples have a good memory: History remembers the past so as to avoid making mistakes in the future. It will also remember the moral decline of the present administration, which can hardly be said to have proved equal to the responsibility that the United States, as a major power, is called on to bear for the maintenance of world peace.

FURTHER COMMENTARY ON SECRETARY BROWN'S VISIT

Military Sales

ID111624 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 11 Jan 80 ID

[Text] The United States and China have decided to develop military cooperation and to start consultations on this question in the near future. This is reported by China's news agency XINHUA in a comment on the Beijing visit by the American Defense Secretary Harold Brown. In the course of the talks Harold Brown expressed U.S. readiness to sell China equipment that could be used for military purposes. The two sides also discussed joint training on a larger scale of counterrevolutionary gangs for subversive operations in Afghanistan.

Dangers of Alliance With U.S.

OW131020 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0730 GMT 12 Jan 80 OW

[Lavrov commentary: "The Role of the Chinese Armed Forces in the Plans of U.S. Imperialism"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of Defense Brown continues his official visit to China. Through the talks between China's leaders and the chieftains of the Pentagon, people once again understand that they intend to rig up a military alliance. Why is U.S. imperialism pursuing this alliance? Here is our station observer Lavrov's view on this question:

Soldiers of the Chinese Armed Forces: I would like to tell you that there are people who are currently pushing your people and troops into the embrace of U.S. imperialism, the force that for many years strangled the Chinese revolution and helped the Chiang Kai-shek elements and Japanese militarists plunder your country and shed blood in your country. The present leaders in Beijing are smiling at the chieftains of the military machinery of the biggest imperialist country, saying that the so-called strategic interests of the United States and China correspond with each other. How far they have degenerated in betraying their own people!

U.S. imperialists' real strategic interests in Asia are well known throughout the world, that is, to strangle the national liberation movement and use force to impose their will on Asian countries and their peoples, in other words, to use Asians to fight Asians.

U.S. imperialist chieftains want China to play the role as a pitiful and shameful accomplice in dangerous battles. They want Chinese people's liberation army units and their soldiers to serve as cannon fodder.

Please recall that U.S. imperialism was pleased when the leaders in Beijing launched an aggression against Socialist Vietnam. Imperialists are naturally indifferent to losses suffered by the Chinese Armed Forces in this gangster war. The more the Asians die, the happier and more jubilant U.S. imperialism will be. Today, it intends China and Vietnam to fight each other once again. This is due mainly to the Beijing ruling circles' aggressive pro-imperialist policy of betraying their own people's interests.

Commenting on Brown's talks in Beijing, a Hungarian press agency correspondent writes that if China realizes its threat of teaching Vietnam a lesson once again, the United States will be satisfied.

What will the military alliance with the United States bring to the Chinese Armed Forces? If any of you Chinese soldiers think that China will get the most up-to-date combat technology and equipment from the Pentagon, then you are completely wrong. As Brown put it during his visit: The U.S. chieftains have never thought of taking a direct part in the modernization of the Chinese Armed Forces. It is not entirely impossible that, in the future, the United States may sell certain weapons to China. However, such a favor is worth nothing compared to what the imperialists want your country and its armed forces to do in exchange for the favor. If imperialists use China and its armed forces to launch another aggressive action in Asia, Chinese Armed Forces will be bitterly hurt and will sacrifice the lives of tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of soldiers. Consider the costs of the so-called stratetic interests of the U.S. chieftains and Beijing leaders in Asia corresponding with each other!

Shalygin Commentary

LD131636 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The following commentary by Yuriy Shalygin is on the 4-day negotiations of the U.S. defense secretary, Harold Brown, with Chinese leaders in Beijing:

During these days the public in Beijing was told much about the common interests of the United States and China. Newsmen counted that in just one of his speeches the head of the Pentagon mentioned the word cooperation five times. Parallel actions were also mentioned five times. Let us see what this could mean.

Beijing's hostility to relaxation of international tension has been common knowledge for quite a long time as well as its attempts to stop the process of relaxation. Washington's latest steps clearly show its deviation from the policy of relaxation. This is one side of the matter. There are also the openly great-power claims of Washington and Beijing and their plans to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and nations. American imperialism, for instance, has handed the baton of aggression against Vietnam to Chinese hegemonism. Now the American mass media readily take up Beijing's threat to start another invasion. In its turn China interprets the events in Iran and the American-Iranian conflict from the point of view of the United States and shows sympathy for U.S. plans to set up a rapid invasion corps. The United States and China are also conducting parallel actions against Kampuchea. Numerous facts point to the involvement of Washgington and Beijing in the subversive activities against Afghanistan. Thus, there is every reason to speak about a collusion of the United States and Chinese leadership directed against peace and independence of nations. It is not simply a political alliance. Their military alliance is becoming more and more evident. It is by no mere chance that Harold Brown said at a press conference in Beijing that the United States was entering a period of military cooperation with China. In the course of his visit he voiced Washington's readiness to supply China with American technology that could be used for military purposes. There is no sign of a direct arms deal yet, yet the United States has already encouraged its NATO partners to ship arms to China. And the other day the New York TIMES reported that last year the Pentagon worked out a secret report on furnishing China with military technology. The implementation of the program would cost the United States from $41-63 billion. Such plans and calculations are sinister indeed. They reveal the United States and Chinese policies.

Harold Brown's visit has shown that in Beijing the United States has found a suitable partner for putting into effect its strategic plans, first and foremost, in the Middle East and Asia.

REPORTAGE ON SECRETARY BROWN'S VISIT TO JAPAN

Arrival in Tokyo

LD131222 Moscow TASS in English 0947 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tokyo, January 13, TASS--U.S. Defence Secretary Harold Brown arrived here from China today. He is to meet with Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira, and with other representatives of the Japanese Government and is to hold talks with the leadership of the National Defence Agency. As the local press emphasizes, one of important aims of the current visit by the head of the Pentagon to the Japanese islands is in the U.S. endeavours to attach Tokyo more closely to the U.S. global aggressive strategy and to draw Japan into Washington's and Beijing's expansionist policy of interference in the internal affairs of independent Asian peoples.

Meetings With Ministers

LD141014 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 14 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tokyo, January 14, TASS--U.S. Defence Secretary Harold Brown had a series of meetings in the Japanese capital today with Japanese Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira, Foreign Minister Saburo Okita and Enji Kubota, head of the National Defence Agency. As the KYODO news agency reports, the head of the Pentagon demanded an increase in Japanese armed forces and an enhancement of Japan's military role in the international arena.

As the news agency points out, Brown said that during the talks which he had held in the PRC an understanding was reached on combining the USA's and China's efforts in the international arena, with regard to Afghanistan and Kampuchea, in particular. Brown demanded that Japan also increase its contribution to those efforts as a U.S. ally. The U.S. defence secretary said the results of his tour to Beijing showed a coincidence of the U.S. and China's points of view on strategic problems and that the Chinese side showed understanding with regard to U.S. military presence in the Middle East and in the Pacific Ocean as well as the creation of rapid-reaction forces.

Harold Brown insisted that the Government of Japan increase appropriations for military purposes and build up its military potential. The Japanese side made it clear on the whole that it shares Washington's and Beijing's point of view and promised "as far as possible" to increase its armed forces and to augment deductions from the state budget for the maintenance of the U.S. military bases in Japan. At the close of the talks Brown left by air for the USA.

JAPAN 'PRESSED' TO COOPERATE WITH U.S. MIDEAST STRATEGY

OW122121 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1400 GMT 12 Jan 80 OW

[Anatolyev commentary]

[Excerpts] Instead of taking measures to settle the U.S.-Iranian dispute by peaceful means, the United States is stirring up anti-Iranian hysteria and threatening to impose various sanctions on Iran. Meanwhile, the United States has embarked on the road of opposing the Afghan leadership. To this end, the U.S. military is frantically looking for bases to be used as a foothold for military action against Middle East countries. The Egyptian and Israeli leaders have already offered to (?provide) such a foothold. Both Egypt and Israel are situated near Iran. But the United States does not forget Japan in working out a Middle East strategy.

U.S. bases in Japan have been used by the United States to suppress national liberation and revolutionary movements in other countries on many occasions since the end of World War II. In all these cases, the bases were used against the interests of the Japanese people.

Now Japan is being pressed into exacerbating its relations with Iran and Afghanistan. (?Judging from all indications), Iran, much less Afghanistan, has no intention of harming Japan in any way. Japan's oil imports from Iran [words indistinct] account for 20 percent of the total and Iran has already told Japan it is ready to increase its oil supply to Japan.

As for Afghanistan, there seems to be nothing that will cast a dark shadow on Japan-Afghanistan relations. Yet the Japanese envoy to the United States has gone so far as to declare that Japan will not recognize the new Afghan Government. Moreover, under U.S. pressure Japan has announced the suspension of its economic aid to Afghanistan. On the other hand, Japan has announced that it will increase its aid to Pakistan.

True, the Pakistani economy needs foreign aid but here we are concerned about military aid. As indicated by U.S. Defense Secretary Brown's Beijing visit, Washington and Beijing are planning to increase their aid to the mercenaries and troops engaging in aggression against Afghanistan from inside Pakistan territory. Without doubt the increased Japanese aid to Pakistan will be used against Afghanistan. Moreover, such aid is bound to draw legitimate criticism from India. In this way the action being prepared by Japan will lead to a deterioration in Japan's relations with Iran, Afghanistan and other countries. This action is completely out of accord with the assertion of the Japanese foreign policy leaders that Japan will pursue an independent line of maintaining good relations with all countries. It seems that some Japanese are unable to shake off their old way of thinking and cannot regard Japan as anything but a foothold for the Pentagon.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA SCORES JAPANESE 'MILITARIZATION POLICY'

LD140929 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 January 1980 publishes on page 3 a 1,800-word Tokyo dispatch by TASS correspondent V. Kuchko specially for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA entitled "Following a Policy of Militarization." It deals with the campaign being mounted by Japanese military circles to increase spending on the self-defense forces and to indoctrinate people in the need for militarization in the face of the "Soviet military threat." Going on to score Japanese military cooperation with the United States and South Korea, the author maintains that this militarist policy "contradicts not only the Japanese people's fundamental aspirations but also the relaxation of international tension" and "poses a serious threat to the peace and security of Asian peoples."

DPRK PROPOSES INITIATIVE TO UNITE NORTH, SOUTH KOREA

LD121928 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Pyongyang, January 12, TASS--The Korean Worker's Party and the Government of the KDPR came out with a new initiative aimed at the elimination of the split of Korea and at unification of the country. At a press conference held today in Pyongyang, a representative of the Committee for Peaceful Unification of the Motherland said that the vice president of the KDPR, secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, chairman of the Committee for Peaceful Unification of the Motherland Kim Il and Premier of the Administrative Council of the KDPR Yi Chong-ok sent letters to a number of political leaders of the ruling party and oppositional parties of South Korea suggesting a meeting to exchange opinions on the question of unification of the country. The letters say that a consultative conference can be held for independent peaceful unification of Korea. Multilateral talks among political and public organisations can also be held. Panmunjom, Pyongyang, Seoul or a third country are suggested as a venue of the meetings.

KARMAL SENDS MESSAGE TO KHOMEYNI, SEEKS 'CLOSEST RELATIONS'

LD121944 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 12, TASS--The BAKHTAR NEWS AGENCY reports that Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal addressed a message to Ayatollah Khomeyni. The message stresses that certain persons and circles in Iran encouraged by U.S. imperialism staged propaganda and unfriendly actions directed against the revolutionary transformations implemented by the people of Afghanistan, directed against the disinterested assistance of the Soviet Union, Afghanistan's sincere friend, and against the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

On behalf of the leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, Babrak Karmal assured Khomeyni that Afghanistan sincerely wishes to establish the closest relations of friendship and brotherhood with the Islamic Republic of Iran. In our opinion, the message says, there is no such factor that could become the reason for differences between the fraternal Islamic Afghan and Iranian peoples, between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Iran. We are ready to take urgent measures to overcome any misunderstanding between us that stems from the antidemocratic incendiary policy of Amin. We are prepared to take steps so as to send to Iran delegations of goodwill for normalising and consolidating the friendly ties between our countries.

As to the disinterested material and moral assistance from the Soviet Union which is a sincere traditional friend of our nation, the message says, it should be noted that the Afghan Government asked resolutely many times for such assistance to avert an armed attack of Afghanistan's extenal enemies. The leadership and government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declare that after the removal of the danger of aggression and intervention by external enemies of Afghanistan, the limited friendly military contingents of the Soviet Union which are staying in the territory of Afghanistan under the treaty of friendship, goodneighbourliness and cooperation between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the USSR and in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter will immediately return to their peaceful motherland, the Soviet Union.

In conclusion Babrak Karmal assured the leadership of Iran that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will never allow anyone to use Afghanistan as a place d'armes for activities directed aginst the Islamic Iranian revolution and the fraternal Iranian people. We expect the Iranian side friendly to us to assume a similar stand, he declared.

BREZHNEV REMARKS RECEIVE WIDE SUPPORT IN AFGHANISTAN

LD131706 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Our special correspondents, Farid Seyful-Mulyukov and Viktor Bazilyevich report from Kabul:

Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's replies to the questions from the PRAVDA correspondent became known today to broad masses of the public in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The full text of the replies by Comrade Brezhnev were broadcast first on the radio and soon afterwards on television. The fundamental propositions of this document, particularly those which clearly and profoundly analyze the events in Afghanistan, reveal the military and political intereference of the NATO states in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and set out our principled friendly policy toward the neighboring state, were repeatedly broadcast by Kabul Radio in various national languages.

Afghan journalists and public figures are calling our correspondents' post in the TASS section in Kabul, expressing their profound satisfaction with the replies of Comrade Brezhnev which have revealed the truth about the events surrounding Afghanistan not only to the Soviet people but also to millions of Afghans and the entire world public. A speech by Zairi, former minister for social health in the Amin government, has been shown on Kabul television. During the first days following the December democratic coup [perevorot] reaction spread rumors to the effect that all members of the former government had been killed. How great was their disappointment when Saleh Muhammad Zairi, who with concrete facts exposed the usurper Amin and told about the difficult struggle which the healthy forces of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan had waged against his fruitless policy, appeared on the television screen. Even greater discomfiture seized the provocateurs when they learned that prominent participants in the April revolution such as Zairi, Panjshiri, and others who during the brief period of the Amin government were formally in his government but in fact offered him resistance, were included in the new ruling organs of Afghanistan.

The democratic reconstruction is progressing not only in Kabul but also in the provinces. Governors have already been appointed for many provinces in the country. The process of eliminating the serious consequences of the Amin administration is continuing. Special government commissions to investigate his crimes against the people, party and revolution are working. As Babrak Karmal stated at the press conference for foreign journalists, documentary facts on these crimes will be published soon.

For more than 2 weeks Afghanistan has been living according to a new political calendar. It is a stormy time in the country; an extremely responsible one. It is necessary to explain the truth about the revolution to the people who have been deceived and oppressed and whose best sons have been wiped out. It is necessary to protect its gains and the independence and the security of the country from armed intervention by the imperialists and their accomplices who are waging an undeclared war against revolutionary Afghanistan, as Comrade Brezhnev emphasized. It is necessary to resolve the complex internal problems and begin social and economic construction. All this demands time, persistence and flexibility. It is still too early to sum up any results, but it can already be said that the democratic changes in this long-suffering country are meeting with an increasing response in the minds and hearts of millions of Afghans.

AFGHAN GOVERNMNET, PARTY LEADERS APPOINTED; KARMAL CHAIRS PLENUM

LD111634 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 11, TASS--A plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan has been held here under the chairmanship of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal. Upon its completion, the press published the composition of the steering bodies of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the Revolutionary Council and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan includes Babrak Karmal, Asadollah Sarwari, Anahita Ratebzadeh, Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand, Saleh Mohammad Ziray, Gholam Dastagir Panjshiri and Nur Ahmad Nur.

At the plenary meeting it was noted that in the formation of the Revolutionary Council and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and also governmental bodies the principle of representation of all links of the National Front should be observed. As the first step to establish such a front, it has been decided to include into the government three non-party ministers (agriculture, trade and public health). They will also become members of the Revolutionary Council. The plenary meeting emphasized that it is necessary to broadly attract non-party specialists, scientists, intellectuals with the necessary experience to affairs involved in the management of the state.

The plenary meeting recommended that the leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in accordance with the policy of the party should open negotiations with representatives of different strata of the population, national and democratic organizations, the patriotically-minded religious leaders. The party and the government, it was noted by the plenary meeting, should take all the measures necessary to ensure freedom and security of the people, peace and tranquility in the country, to eliminate gangs of terrorists, killers and plunderers--agents of international imperialism and reaction.

All conditions for the return home must be ensured to the citizens of Afghanistan who were compelled to leave the country as a result of persecution by the Amin clique, stressed the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.

CLAIM OF SOVIET ARMY 'OCCUPYING' KABUL REJECTED

LD121414 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 12, TASS--TASS special correspondents Yuriy Kornikov and Rafil Musin report:

Western propaganda, stepping up a slanderous noisy campaign around Afghanistan, is spreading inventions which vie with each other in absurdity: These include assertions to the effect that Kabul has nearly been "occupied by Soviet troops" and fabrications about "tensions" allegedly reigning in Afghan capital. A record of sorts in dreaming up such inventions was established by the British REUTER news agency which reported that allegedly the Soviet army units both occupied Kabul and transformed all the former imperial palaces into army barracks. No more and no less!

We asked Kabul's Mayor Shereka Kharakat to comment this report by the British news agency, he said that REUTER's assertions are a lie and a malicious lie at that: There is a United Kingdom Embassy in Kabul, there are also at present a no small number of British newsmen here and they cannot fail to see that there is no "occupation" of the city whatsoever. Neither are there any "army barracks" in the former imperial palaces. The best of these palaces--Gulhana--has been proclaimed by the revolutionary government as the house of the peoples.

The palaces Pagman and Delkusha which after the April revolution became the heritage of the people are preserved in an excellent condition, as to the Chehel-Sotun palace, remarkable for its architecture, a mere few days ago a big press conference was organized there for Afghan and foreign newsmen and almost two hundred newsmen from different countries, including the United Kingdom, could see for themselves that the magnificent palace does not house any "army barracks".

So one is entitled to ask as to where the misinformers from the British news agency got their information about the "army barracks." They just simply invented it.

In touting a patent lie, the REUTER news agency is hiding behind references to some anonymous "diplomatic sources", Sheraka Kharakat said. In actual fact, however, the source of these inventions is only one: It is the imperialist and reactionary circles which, having failed in their attempts to undermine our revolution through armed provocations from outside, are now trying to obtain their unseemly objectives through a resort to frenzied lies and slander.

ALL AFGHAN POLITICAL PRISONERS FREED; SECRET PRISONS SUSPECTED

LD121834 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 12, TASS--All political prisoners who were thrown into prisons by the clique of dictator Amin and who remained alive have been released in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. This was announced by the national radio and television of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

A governmental statement published here stresses that all the patriots who were victimized by Amin's henchmen have been released and reunited with their families. As to recent reports about the existence of some secret prisons, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan called upon the citizens to inform it of all facts confirming their existence.

It was already reported that General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal mentioned in his recent speech a possibility of the existence of such secret prisons created by Amin and his accomplices.

The newspaper HAQIQAT-E ENGELAB-E SAWR published a statement of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan proclaiming January 13, 1980, the day of national mourning. The statement says that bloody dictator Amin threw into prisons and destroyed thousands of intellectuals, clergymen, workers, engineers, scientists, doctors, writers, political and public figures of the country, including a number of former ministers, as well as more than one thousand members of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. On the basis of the existing documents the Government of Afghanistan will try to draw up and publish the lists of victims.

The Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the Revolutionary Council and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Babrak Karmal personnally expressed condolences to the families that lost their dear ones. Mourning ceremonies will be held on January 13 in remembrance of the deceased in all mosques of Afghanistan. Flags at state institutions will be lowered. A special book of condolences will be open in the residence of the prime minister. The national radio and television will broadcast special programmes.

Day of Mourning

LD131619 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 13, TASS--A day of mourning is observed in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan today.

State flags are at half-mast at all institutions in memory of those who perished or were tortured in prison on the instruction of imperialism's agent Amin and his flunkeys. Special prayer services to commemorate the victims of Amin's tyranny were held in mosques. Clergymen called upon the Moslems to strengthen unity in defending the home land from designs of international imperialism which encroaches upon independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Afghanistan.

After the overthrow of the hateful Amin clique, released in Afghanistan were more than 10,000 political prisoners who languished in prison. That step of the new Afghan leadership has been broadly supported by the popular masses.

In the government's statement, published by the local press, it is said that there are no political prisoners in prisons now. In the statement it is emphasized that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is fully determined to restore revolutionary order and law in the country.

KAM Security Organization Abolished

LD131620 Moscow TASS in English 1501 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 13, TASS--The Afghan news agency BAKHTAR has distributed a statement of the Revolutionary Council and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, reporting the abolition of the KAM security service. That organisation, formed after the April revolution, made a profound contribution to the cause of defending the country from designs of counterrevolution. But later it was used by traitor Amin and also by his retinue and close relatives as a tool for strengthening personal power, for stifling freedom and for terror against dissidents.

In the statement it is noted that the state security service Khad is formed within the framework of governmental organisations with a view to defend democratic liberties, national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country, to defend the interests of the revolution, to frustrate conspiracies and designs of external enemies of Afghanistan. The new organisation, which will be under direction of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, is bound to help ensure freedom and security of the Afghan citizens, to fight against terrorists, robbers, killers, saboteurs and spies, for ensuring peace and security in the country.

AFGHAN MINISTRY DETAILS PAKISTANI AID TO COUNTERREVOLUTIONARIES

LD131204 Moscow TASS in English 1118 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 13, TASS--TASS correspondent Yuriy Kornilov reports:

This occurred in Tarham, a small inhabited locality on the Afghan-Pakistani border, a trade caravan which was on its way with bales of tea from Pakistan to the DRA seemed suspicious to Afghan border guards. During an examination it turned out that the bales and crates were filled not by tea at all but by quite a different sort of goods--bundles of counterrevolutionary brochures and leaflets published in Pakistan and containing slander on the Afghan revolution and calls for the overthrow of the legitimate Government of the DRA.

The episode in Tarham is only one of many facts indicating that the DRA's external enemies in an increasingly active way resort to the poisoned weapon of lies and slander, the TASS correspondent was told at the main board for the protection of the revolution of the DRA's Ministry of the Interior.

Counterrevolutionary forces, based in Pakistan, launched a fierce propaganda war against the DRA. They rely on a lavish backing of Western special services, first of all the U.S. CIA, on a backing of Pakistani reaction which united in the ranks of the Jamiat-e-Islam party and other ultra-rightist organizations and make use of the obvious connivance of the official authorities of Pakistan. It is in Pakistan's territory that subversive Afghan radio centres calling for "blowing up the revolution" entrenched themselves. It is in Pakistan's territory that all sorts of anti-Afghan counter-revolutionary books, "manifestoes", "appeals", etc. are fabricated and duplicated in many thousands of copies. According to existing data, with Pakistani reaction's support the counter-revolutionaries got an opportunity to widely use for their subversive slanderous activity the printing facilities of such big Pakistani newspapers as NAWA-I-WAQT and IMROZE (Lahore), JANG (Karachi), HURRIYET (Rawalpindi).

Simultaneously with the step-up of propagandist attacks against the DRA, the external enemies of the Afghan revolution also continues armed bandit inroads upon our country, a spokesman of the Afghan Ministry of the Interior said. In Pakistan there are now not less than 50 strong points and at least 20 special bases where anti-Afghan bandit formations are knocked together. At the biggest of the bases, located in Peshawar, Chitral, Parachinar, Attock, Miramshah, raiders, bandits and terrorists, are "trained" by Pakistani military instructors who act under the direction of U.S. and Beijing "advisers." We also possess information that one of the leaders of anti-Afghan formations held "talks" with Beijing's emissaries. The aim of the talks was to get Beijing's consent to the "training" of part of the bandits directly in China. Penetrating into the DRA's territory, bandit formations and individual terrorists demolish state institutions burn down hospitals and schools and atrociously do away with PDPA activists, with teachers and destroy peaceful hamlets. In the recent period such kind of facts took place in Kunar, Paktya, Nangarhar and some other provinces.

In the course of the twenty months that have passed since the April revolution, the intrigues of Afghanistan's external enemies, whatever their methods, inevitably ended in failure one after another. The spokesman of the DRA's Ministry of the Interior said in conclusion: Those intrigues are doomed to failure all the more now that our people in its struggle against outside aggressive armed actions relies on the Soviet Union's fraternal assistance and support and when the Afghan people, upon having destroyed and eliminated the band of Amin, that agent of the CIA, is full of determination to uphold and multiply the gains of the April revolution.

AFGHAN 'TRAITORS' ADMIT TRAINING BY U.S., PRC INSTRUCTORS

LD140046 Moscow in English to Africa 2000 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Here is a dispatch from (Kamil Rashidov), the Kabul correspondent of the Soviet national daily IZVESTIYA.

There are three of them, three young men. All three fought on the side of the enemy. They are traitors. Two were brainwashed and the third was recruited from among criminals. One is called (Abdullah Boyis). He has been a student at Kabul University. Another is (Abdol Malek), a man who dropped out of school when he was in the eighth year. And the third, (Abdol Bazir), deserted a cadet college. The three strong men sit with heads lowered.

They regret what they have done. They could have regretted it before. (?Still and all), they do regret it. They are giving more and more details to the investigator. They have already pleaded guilty and are anticipating the trial.

Who trained you at the camps? This question is put to all three but their answers coincide: American and Chinese instructors. What was the training like? It turns out they were trained like the American Green Berets. They trained to be cutthroats. (Boyis) and (Malek) were trained in killing at (Gurbahartovi) near Peshawar in Pakistan, and (Abdol Bazir) spent his 3 months of training at (Korani), in Pakistan. He had a group of men under his command.

What mission was assigned to you? We were ordered to insure arms shipments to Afghanistan: 30 rifles, 20 submachineguns, 200 handgrenades and 25,000 bullets. Besides, we were ordered to prepare a camp at (Tezin) village and wait for reinforcements. What concretely has your group done? (Bazir) says: They set fire to crops, attacked villages and cut power transmission lines.

Who gave you the last instructions? There comes the unanimous reply again: American and Chinese instructors. They were the examiners and they blessed us, too.

So this is fresh evidence of meanness and low-down action, an example of the so-called Afghan policy made by the enemies of the Afghan revolution and Afghan people.

Criticism of U.S., PRC 'Interference'

LD111348 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The other day NBC showed a reportage from a special military training camp in Pakistan. American television audiences had a chance to see how counterrevolutionaries are being taught to wage war in Afghanistan against the revolutionary government. The report noted that thousands of men are being trained in such military camps in Pakistan and the teachers are American and Chinese instructors. Similar reportages have been shown this week on television in Britain, France, Federal Germany and other Western countries. According to London TIMES reports from one of the military camps in Pakistan trained armed groups systematically cross the Pakistani-Afghan border and wage war on the Afghan Army. Needless to say, these actions of the United States and China amount to aggressive interference in the Afghan people's domestic affairs and threaten the peace and security of both the Afghan and the Pakistani people. But the most significant fact is that the military camps in Pakistan which Americans have seen on television this week were created by the CIA just after the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan. It was at this time that Washington elaborated a dangerous plan for military interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

In May last year NEWSWEEK reported that the administration was discussing secret U.S. interference in Afghanistan directed against the Taraki revolutionary government. According to other American press reports, in April 1979 the assistant secretary of state, Warren Christopher, urged the Pakistan Government to help prepare Afghan counterrevolutionary groups and a Lebanese magazine AL-KIFAH AL-'ARABI reported at the time that 20 military training camps for Afghan counterrevolutionary bands were operating in Pakistan along the Pakistani-Afghan border.

Here is one more fact: The Washington magazine COUNTERSPY reported last December that two leaders of the Afghan counterrevolutionaries were in fact U.S. citizens and had visited the State Department in March 1979 and had a talk with officials. The magazine underlined that the CIA was directly involved in training armed groups of so-called Afghan rebels and in sending them to Afghanistan. It goes without saying that this top secret CIA operation to crush the Afghan people's revolution created an extremely tense situation which was the one reason why the Soviet Union finally decided to meet the Afgan Government's repeated request to provide it with military help under the Soviet-Afghan treaty.

The aim of the assistance is to help the Afghan Government rebuff military aggression from the outside and protect the country's independence. Now the secret operation of the administration in Washington is known to the world. The dangerous consequences it has led to seem obvious. But still the U.S. administration continues the same policy. It has announced plans for additional American help to Pakistan for their venture. The WALL STREET JOURNAL notes in an article captioned "Dangerous Policy" that Pakistan is a training bulwark for 300,000 Afghan rebels. Let me add that these forces are being armed largely with American weapons. They are being trained by American and Chinese instructors. They are financed by the U.S. administration and their aim is to continue to interfere in th internal affairs of Afghanistan and to fight against its revolutionary government. This is truly a dangerous policy.

PUSHTUN LEADER CITED ON SOVIET 'DISINTERESTED AID'

LD111146 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 11, TASS--TASS correspondent Leonid Biryukov reports:

Now, after the victory of the new stage of the April revolution, all the necessary conditions have been created in our native Afghanistan for consolidation of unity and stronger cohesion of the people of the country, for a quick and successful development of the national economy, for raising the living standards of the people. One cannot but experience feelings of profound joy and satisfaction over the fact that the principles of democracy have been fully restored in the country, that the new leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, backed by our friends and their disinterested aid, took effective measures to protect our sacred homeland, its territorial integrity and national sovereignty from all sorts of encroachments from outside. This has been stated in Jalalabad to the TASS correspondent by Gafar Khan, a veteran and competent Pushtu tribe leader.

The Pushtus, just as other peoples and nationalities inhabiting Afghanistan, express sincere indignation at the slanderous hullabaloo which has been raised in the West around Afghanistan and the so-called "Afghan issue". That campaign is being held by imperialists in order to speculate around that non-existent "issue" on international arena and at international organizations, above all the United Nations, said Gafar Khan. Assertions of external enemies of our country on imaginary "interference" on the part of the USSR into internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is an obvious and indisguised lie, since it is known to everybody that the Soviet Union gave us assistance in accordance with the request of the Afghan leadership, and that aid is based on such generally-recognized international documents as the Afghan-Soviet treaty of 1978 and the U.N. Charter. As to declarations and assertions about "interference" imperialists needed those fabrications in order to smear Afghanistan, to divert the attention of international public from their own aggressive actions with regard to independent sovereign states, for instance Iran.

The imperialists, who profusely declare that they allegedly take care of "independence" of our country, in reality themselves grossly interfere into Afghan affairs. The testimony of this is the use of Afghan refugees, mostly people confused and stupified by hostile propaganda, for struggle against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its revolutionary government, said Gafar Khan. Groupings hostile to our people are formed on the territory of neighbouring Pakistan. And this, certainly, cannot but complicate Afghan-Pakistani relations. Such a situation only plays into the hand of our common enemy--imperialism. The relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan must be ironed out--and this should be made on the basis of friendly and frank high-level negotiations, said Gafar Khan.

The Pushtus, he said in conclusion, express full support for the new leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and are fully determined to more actively join the struggle for major positive transformations which are being put on the order of the day by the new stage of the April revolution.

NEW AFGHAN REGIME SEEKS TO REASSURE RELIGIOUS BELIEVERS

LD111850 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Our special correspondents Farid Seyful-Mulyukov and Viktor Bazilevich, report from Kabul: [read by announcer]

Friday is a nonworking day in Afghanistan. There is no rush and less hurly-burly on the streets of Kabul. The people are resting from their daily affairs and concerns. When strolling through the streets of Kabul one sees the whole variety of Afghanistan: Pashtoons and Noorestainis, Baluchis and Hazaris, Uzbeks and Tajiks. The Muslim people of Afghanistan are made up of many nations. Ninety percent of the population professes Islam of the Sunni or Shi'a tradition. The Afghans, regardless of their position in society, observe their national traditions and respect the feelings of believers.

We recall how from the very first days of the April revolution the Democratic Government of Afghanistan, headed by Taraki, proclaimed as one of the main points of its domestic policy respect for the Islamic religion and the patriotic clergy in the country took a favorable attitude toward people's power. All mosques and schools remained open. Islam is taught in the schools and religious festivals are observed. Religious Afghans freely go on pilgrimages to Mecca and Medina.

Moreover, in showing concern for the people, the Democratic authorities provided aid to the poorest clergy. In rural areas they have started getting land together with the peasants. This principled and flexible policy of the April revolution took the chief trump away from the enemies of the Afghan people who assert that the establishment of the democratic regime had profaned the sacred land of Islam.

Gangs of counterrevolutionaries armed with U.S. and Chinese weapons, which the people had dubbed "ekhwane ashayatin"--the brothers of the devil--burnt down villages and brutally murdered ordinary people, including patriotically minded religious ministers.

The situation in the country became inflamed. The ferocity of the Amin regime which jailed and executed thousands of Afghan patriots and propaganda-deluded people brought more grist to the mill of the reactionaries.

Feigning a sanctimonious concern for the Islamic people of Afghanistan, imperialist and reactionary forces prepared for a decisive assault against the gains of the April revolution.

The December events in the country abruptly changed the whole situation. The new revolutionary leadership, headed by Babrak Karmal restored democratic norms. More than 10,000 political prisoners were released from jail and these included no few ministers. We saw them at the gates of Pol-e Charkhi jail.

In his policy statement Babrak Karmal said that the principles of Islam, freedom of conscience and religious belief and of the performance of religious rites, would be respected in Democratic Afghanistan. Millions of Afghan believers and the patriotic clergy of that country approve the constructive steps of the new government.

FOREIGN PRESS CITED ON AFGHAN PEOPLE'S SUPPORT FOR NEW REGIME

LD122154 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 12, TASS--The newspaper DAILY WORID published a reportage of its correspondent in Kabul. He writes, specifically, that the people of Afghanistan experiences a tremendous relief in connection with the fact that the grim days of the rule of the bloody dictator Amin and his accomplices are gone forever. He writes that all the people with whom he talked, spoke with gratitude about the Soviet Union's timely assistance rendered to Afghanistan at its requests. They expressed the confidence that Afghanistan will soon be rid of the threat of the hostile forces that got entrenched at its borders and penetrated the country. The correspondent writes that people whom he met support the present government headed by Babrak Karmal. He writes he got a strong impression that genuine freedom and democracy now reign in Afghanistan and it is optimistic about the future. The Afghan people wants only one thing, that the United States and China should stop plotting against it and stop using Pakistan's territory for preparing intrusions.

Beirut, January 12, TASS--Kabul is living these days through the period of transformations. The people of the capital and other cities of Afghanistan show their resolve to uphold the gains of the April revolution from encroachments and interference of internal counter-revolution and foreign enemies, a correspondent of the Lebanese newspaper AN-NIDA writes from Kabul. One sees there for oneself the sincerity of the feelings of the people for the lawful authorities of the country, the firm support of the people for the new leadership and the course it conducts.

Imperialism is now conducting an unbridled campaign, seeking to present the situation in Afghanistan as "chaos". But facts cannot be denied. The joy and enthusiasm of the masses expose this propaganda hullaballoo that is needed by the West, above all by the USA for the implementation of its criminal subversive designs and plans against the Afghan revolution. A strong support by the Afghans for the transformations in the country is a clear proof that the Afghan people is for the strengthening and development of internal unity, for the country's development on a democratic basis and also bespeaks of the readiness of the Afghan people to frustrate all intrigues of internal and external reaction.

Paris, January 12, TASS--In the article headlined "Tranquility in Kabul: Experience and Difficulties," the newspaper L'HUMANITE writes: Kabul now looks as a city in which tranquility reigns. Afghan soldiers are ensuring security in the streets and in front of public buildings. In the area where stores and shops are situated, the population is engaged in its usual activities. People crowd near traders in fruit and vegetables.

The Afghan people is now living through a period of transformations. Its meaning is democratisation of the country, drawing up of the draft constitutions, release of political prisoners. All this meets the wishes of the majority of the Afghans.

The government relies on supporters who are full of enthusiasm and dedication. But it is yet to overcome numerous obstacles, the biggest of which being the feudal structure of the country, the actions of those who are not interested in the present changes, and, finally, pressure from the outside that is exerted by the United States jointly with China.

PAKISTANI ECONOMY EXPERIENCING 'HARD TIME', AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

LD122322 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Delhi, January 12, TASS--The Pakistani economy is experiencing hard time. The testimony of this is the annual account of the State Bank of Pakistan on the state of affairs in the country's economy. The figures, cited in the account, show that the growth of capital investments is on the decline, agriculture and industry are in a state of stagnation, inflation is on the rise, the average growth of wholesale and retail prices in 1978-1979 fiscal year amounted respectively to 8.3 and 6.7 per cent. But, in the opinion of commentators, writes the newspaper TIMES OF INDIA, these figures are obviously understated. The pace of growth in the processing industry reduced down to 3.7 per cent as compared with 10 per cent in 1977-1978. Private employers sell enterprises and remit money abroad and this is caused by the continuing political instability in the country, lack of firm gurantees for capital investors.

Despite a certain growth in Pakistan's exports, the balance of payements is invariably largely unfavourable which is to a major extent linked with the growth of prices of oil in the world market and a rise in expenditures for the purchase of armaments. This compels the government to resort to foreign loans. This intensifies the country's dependence on Western capital which is already great. Pakistan's external debt in 1979 reached 7,500 million dollars.

The share of commodities in the gross national product has been steadily on the decline in the recent years. In the 1978-1979 fiscal year that share amounted to 47.2 per cent. More than half of Pakistan's gross national product is ensured through services.

Stagnation in the agriculture, which is the mainstay of the country's economy, gives rise to the most serious anxiety of the authorities, writes TIMES OF INDIA. The process of enrichment of an insignificant part of owners and impoverishment of the majority of the peasantry has been witnessed in the past 20 years in the agriculture which develops a along capitalist lines.

In the opinion of the newspaper, the sickness, which has hit the Pakistani economy, has assumed a universal character.

Application of Antiworker Laws

LD081121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Correspondent V. Baykov report: "Bans Maintained"]

[Text] Islamabad, 3 January--The ban on the activity of political parties and trade unions introduced by the military authorities in Pakistan is being maintained. A military court in Rawalpindi recently sentenced (M. Batta), general secretary of the Railroad Workers' Trade Union, to a year's hard labor and a flogging. The newspaper MUSLIM reports that the worker activist was punished for an attempt to organize a meeting of railroad workers in support of their economic demands.

In reporting this fact the local progressive press notes that the harsh wartime laws now in operation essentially deprive the Pakistani working people of the possibility of acting in defense of their vital rights, although their material situation is deteriorating daily. The cost of living and inflation are rising rapidly in the country, while wages have remained frozen for the past 3 years.

BREZHNEV, KOSYGIN SEND CONGRATULATIONS TO INDIRA GANDHI

LD141141 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Text of Leonid Brezhnev and Aleksey Kosygin message of congratulations to Indira Gandhi]

[Text] To Her Excellency Mrs Indira Gandhi, prime minister of India:

Respected Mrs Prime Minister, on behalf of the Soviet leadership we send heartfelt congratulations in connection with your appointment to the high post of prime minister of the Republic of India and sincere wishes of great successes in your activity.

In the Soviet Union you are known as a prominent Indian political figure and stateswoman and a consistent continuer of the course of Jawaharlal Nehru, who was at the source of Soviet-Indian friendship and your personal contribution to the cause of broadening and deepening Soviet-Indian relations is highly appreciated.

As we recall with satisfaction our meetings and talks in Moscow and Delhi, we express the firm confidence that the friendly relations and multifaceted cooperation between our countries, based on the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation, will undergo new development in the name of the vital interests of our peoples and of peace and progress in Asia and throughout the world.

[Signed] L. Brezhnev, A. Kosygin

Preliminary Results of Elections

LD111441 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Correspondent V. Shurygin dispatch: "Results of the Elections in India: Indian National Congress' Major Victory"]

[Text] Delhi, 9 January--The preliminary results of voting in the extraordinary parliamentary elections have been summed up. The Indian National Congress Party headed by Indira Gandhi has won a convincing victory. This party has received about 350 of the 542 seats in the house of the people, thus securing the right to form the government. Its main rivals--the former ruling Janata Party which has brought only 30 deputies into the new Parliament instead of the 205 which it had in the previous Parliament and also the Lok Dal Party, whose parliamentary representation has been reduced from 77 to 40 deputies as a result of the present elections--suffered a serious defeat.

India with its mixed economy, extremely complex political and social structure of society, in a country where two-thirds of the 650 million-strong population are illiterate, the outcome of elections depends on the interaction of many factors. Experience has shown that the Janata Party, which came to power in 1977, did not justify the expectations of the broad masses. Composed of heterogeneous parties and groups, the Janata Party devoted more attention to questions of intraparty struggle among the various factions and leaders than to solving the country's basic socioeconomic tasks. The Lok Dal Party, whose leaders declared it to be the defender of the farmers' interests, relies mainly on the support of the prosperous and middle peasantry from the Jat caste which inhabits the north of the country in Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab and Rajasthan states. Finally, the Indian National Congress Party led by D. Urs as the elections have shown, has virtually no mass base; its representation in Parliament has fallen to 12 deputies.

The elections have shown that depite its defeat in 1977, the Indian National Congress--Indira Party [INC-I] remains, in the eyes of the bulk of the Indian voters, the party once led by M.K. Gandhi and Jawahar Lal Nehru and now headed by his daughter Indira Gandhi. In her election speeches she stressed her party's unfailing devotion to Nehru's course in domestic and foreign policy, promised to insure political stability, legality and order in the country and implement the 20-point program of socioeconomic measures put forward by her government in 1975 which envisages an improvement of the situation of the poorest sections of India's population. All this played its part and affected the election results. Many local newspapers write that the convincing victory of the INC-I is to a significant degree the personal success for its leader Indira Gandhi.

The present parliamentary elections in India are also significant for the fact that for the first time since the split in the Indian communist movement in 1964 the two communist parties--the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India (Marxist)--acted jointly and did not have their candidates run against one another in the electoral districts. This cooperation became possible thanks to the rapprochement of the two parties over questions of the country's internal political and economic development and their approach to a number of international problems. The Communist Party of India views this rapprochement in terms of insuring the unity of all leftwing and democratic forces on the basis of a joint struggle in defense of the working people's interests and for the country's development along the path of peace, democracy and social progress.

The leftwing parties have succeeded in not only retaining but also increasing their representation in Parliament. The communist party of India has 10 deputies instead of 7 in the new Parliament. The Communist Party of India (Marxist) has achieved substantial successes in the elections. It brought 33 deputies into Parliament--11 more than in the last elections.

Indian CP Statement

LD121146 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Delhi, January 12, TASS--The Communist Party of India is fully determined to actively come out in support of further consolidation of unity of all left and democratic forces of the country, consolidation of the links between the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India (Marxist), stresses a statement which was adopted at a meeting of the Central Secretariat of the National Council of the Communist Party of India that has been held here.

Left and democratic organizations, which put up a united front, should become a powerful nation force defending the interests of the popular masses and waging unabated struggle against imperialism, neocolonialism, foreign and Indian monopolistic capital. Big land owners and reaction. The results of the January pre-term parliamentary elections convincingly testify to the growth of the weight and prestige of the left and democratic forces among the electorate. Largely expanded was the representation of deputies from left parties in the lower chamber of the country's supreme legislative body. A statement of the Central Secretariat of the National Council of the Communist Party of India expresses confidence that these parliamentarians will be able to successfully uphold the legitimate rights of the Indian working people, to fight for the implementation in the country of profound socioeconomic transformations.

INDIRA GANDHI SHOWS CONCERN OVER U.S. ARMS PROPOSAL

LD112137 Moscow Tass in English 2112 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Paris, January 11, Tass--President of the Indian National Congress Indira Gandhi, who has been instructed by the Indian president to form the country's government, gave an interview to the France inter radio-station. Speaking on the situation in the South-Western part of Asia, she said: "We are particularly concerned over President Carter's proposal to sell arms to Pakistan. These arms can be used against Afghanistan, and against us, as well as against the Pakistani people itself." She pointed out that Pakistani arms were already directed against us [as received] in the past.

Touching on the negotiations in Beijing between U.S. Defence Secretary Harold Brown and the Chinese leadership, which, as is known, dwelt on questions related to the interference by the United States and China in the affairs of Asian countries, Indira Gandhi said that this poses a great danger to us and the whole region. She stressed that China also poses a danger to us and harbors clear-cut expansionist aspirations. We have already suffered from them.

Indira Gandhi pointed out that she will submit the question of recognizing the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea for the Parliament's consideration. She said that the present Kampuchean Government effects control in the country and we always recognized such a government in similar cases.

We are interested in peace since it is absolutely needed for us, for our economic development, Indira Gandhi stressed. Participating in the non-alignment movement, we proceed from the interests of peace in our region and throughout the world, she pointed out.

MARCHAIS DISCUSSES WORLD SITUATION, AFGHANISTAN

LD112152 Moscow in French to Europe 1730 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Dear listeners, Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party [PCF] who is on a visit to the USSR at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, granted an interview today to Soviet television. We suggest you listen to an excerpt of this. You know that talks took place in Moscow from 8 to 10 January between the CPSU delegation led by Leonid Brezhnev and the PCF delegation led by its Secretary General Georges Marchais. Here is his interview on soviet television.

[Begin recording] [Question] Now, that the summit meeting between the delegations of the CPSU and of the PCF has ended, I would like to ask you how do you see the balance of these negotiations, and then, how do you view the importance of this meeting in the present international situation.

[Answer] Well, there is an extremely positive balance. Obviously, we began first of all with a discussion of the situations in our respective countries. This was very important for becoming familiar with the questions and the activities of our two parties. Obviously, we devoted much time to an examination of the international situation. Here, I believe one can say that our two parties have an identical position, identical positions in the examination of the power relations at the world level. This is extremely important because, finally, everything starts out from there. Our joint opinion is that the power relations are evolving, evolving in favor of the forces of progress, of democracy, of independence and of socialism. But, naturally, imperialism does not remain with arms folded, as one says. It is reacting. Hence the present situation which is characterized by the existence of a certain amount of tension in various parts of our world. In Europe, there is the monstrous decision of NATO to deploy U.S. missiles on the borders of the USSR; there is the intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan which has compelled the Soviet Government to apply the treaty of friendship concluded between the Afghan Government and the Soviet Government. As a result, there is at the same time an evolution of the power relations that is favorable and, also, obviously, the existence of certain tensions. So what conclusions have we drawn from an examination of this situation? Well, we have drawn the only possible conclusion: One must fight, one must fight harder in order force upon imperialism respect for a certain number of principles that we adhere to.

We adhere--we say so in our joint communique--to noninterference in the internal affairs of the peoples, we adhere to disarmament. Therefore we believe that in the coming period it is necessary to intensify efforts, first of all, to bring about the ratification of the SALT II agreement, that is extremely important. One must fight to try and impede the deployment of new missiles in Europe. A certain number of objectives exist which allow us to draw conclusions from this meeting, namely that this joint position will lead us to strengthen our action. Naturally, we have affirmed that we wish to be able to develop our action with all the other forces in the world that are interested in peace, in detente and disarmament. In addition, we have examined the problems connected with the fight for socialism, we have examined the problems connected with cooperation between our two communist parties. There are differences on certain questions there are even divergences, we say so, but we have reached agreement on two ideas which are essential to us. The first is that we will continue our discussions, and the second that all this must not impede joint action between our parties. So you see, it is a positive balance. In connection with the first question I would like to add, because it is important, that obviously we have also subscribed to the idea of the strengthening of cooperation between France and the USSR in the political, economic, scientific and cultural fields. This is a necessity. We are in agreement.

At the end of my visit to Moscow--we are leaving tomorrow--in my own name and in the name of the PCF delegation, I want to thank Comrade Leonid Brezhnev, the CPSU, the Soviet workers we have met, the cosmonauts we met this morning, I want to thank all for the friendly welcome accorded to us, and I want to wish the Soviet people new successes in the task (?awaiting them). [end recording]

[Moscow TASS in English at 2000 GMT on 11 January 1980 adds: "The following has taken place in Afghanistan, Georges Marchais went on. In 1978, that country under the guidance of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan decided to put an end to the feudalism and to take the road of democracy and progress. Imperialism then interfered through its main representative in the region, Pakistan. I saw with my own eyes the proofs of this interference--in the written form and registered on film. I can tell to French TV viewers that the U.S. television company CBS made a film which shows 30 military bases in the territory of Pakistan whose aim is interference in the internal affairs of the Afghan people. Afghanistan has the treaty of friendship, good-neighbourliness and cooperation with the Soviet Union that was signed in 1978. The treaty envisages that at the request of one of the two sides, the other side can give it military assistance to ensure its independence and inviolability of its frontiers.

["This was precisely what was done by the Afghan Government, George Marchais said stressing that of late the armed intervention from outside had intensified so much that if the Soviet Government had failed to respond to the request addressed to it, this would have been tantamount to a failure on its part to honour an agreement concluded."]

Departure from USSR

LD120912 Moscow TASS in English 0839 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 12, TASS--A delegation of the French Communist Party, led by General Secretary of the French Communist Party George Marchais, left for Paris today. The delegation stayed in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

At the airport, the delegation were seen off by members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Suslov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Boris Ponomarev, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

UK ENVOY IN KABUL RECALLED TO WORK OUT 'HARSHER POLICY'

LD112324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] According to AFP, the British Government has recalled its ambassador in Kabul for consultations. Observers note that in all probability he has been called to London to work out an even harsher policy toward Afghanistan. The ambassador will depart by air for the British capital following a meeting with UK Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington in Islamabad on 14 January.

COMMENTATOR SAYS SOVIETS WILL NOT ALLOW IRAN SANCTIONS

NC111322 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 11 Jan 80 NC

[Talk by Igor Sheftunov: "The Soviet Union Opposes the **Imposing** of Economic Sanctions on Iran"]

[Text] These days U.S. leaders, contrary to logical thinking, are trying to increase their pressure on Iran. Carter, and the institutions supporting him, actually want to force Iran to ignore its revolutionary gains. One of the means that they use in order to reach this objective is exerting economic pressure on Iran. In November, the White House used the arrest of a number of American Embassy employees in Tehran as an excuse and, contrary to all international laws, froze all Iranian assets in American banks. Before that, the U.S. refrained from returning to Iran wealth **amassed** by the shah which, according to the Americans themselves, exceeds the 25-billion dollar mark.

Other efforts to exert economic pressures on Iran were also made. In addition to this, Washington is now exerting pressure on other countries in order to make the Security Council impose economic sanctions on Iran. Even though, according to the **Foreign Ministry** [not specified] spokesman, a large number of Americans after returning from Iran announce that the imposition of economic sanctions will harm efforts aimed at the freeing of the American hostages in Tehran, these maneuvers continue. The Iranian people, who are withstanding imperialist pressure and blackmail, are continuing their fight to reclaim their pillaged wealth, asking that the deposed shah and, in essence, American imperialism which supported his despotic regime, be tried. Their restrictive rule in Iran resulted in the destruction of three million Iranians. Imam Khomeyni and other leaders of Iran's revolution have announced that they will decisively defend justice and right.

There is no doubt that the U.S. representatives who openly announce that they will be able to make the Iranian nation kneel have lost their sense of reality. Can Iran, which has decided to tread the path of independent progress and development, be economically isolated under present circumstances? A powerful socialist camp now exists in the world, and its countries produce more than 40 percent of the world's industrial products. The socialist camp is the natural patron of all countries and nations which defend their freedom and nationhood. Especially, how can there be talk about Iran's economic isolation when Iran is the Soviet Union's close neighbor with which it has not only extensive commercial relations, but which extensively utilizes the Soviet Union's railroads and waterways for the transportation and transit of its goods? Punishing Iran by sanctions and economic isolation is tantamount to a loss of the sense of reality. The Soviet Union and many other countries have repeatedly referred to the need to solve the differences between America and Iran through peaceful means. But U.S. activities and President Carter's remarks on 4 January show that the White House, by beginning efforts to force the economic isolation of Iran and by exerting military and political pressures on it, prefers to use other means. Apparently in Washington they do not sufficiently understand what result their efforts to impose economic isolation on Iran and to exert pressure on it can have. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it should be said that it will not tolerate any type of intervention in Iran's domestic affairs and will not allow the U.S. to fulfill its decision on imposing economic sanctions on Iran.

Possibility of Aid

PA131822 Bogota Cadena Radial Super in Spanish 1758 GMT 13 Jan 80 PA

[Text] Mexico City, AFP: The Soviet Union is willing to grant any sort of aid, including military, to Iran to break the boycott against it imposed by the United States, USSR charge d'affaires in Mexico, Yevgeniy Rubtsov, declared here today. The Soviet diplomat explained that this would only be granted if the government of the Ayatollah Khomeyni requested it, based on international treaties and without violating the principles of self-determination.

IRANIAN OIL MINISTER WARNS AGAINST SUPPORT FOR U.S.

LD121606 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 12 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 12, TASS--Iran's minister of petroleum warned Western countries against the attempts to follow in the wake of the policy of the United States in the Iranian-American conflict. Speaking over Radio Tehran, he made a warning that Iran will stop all deliveries of oil to those countries that will support the United States' demand for economic sanctions against Iran.

STUDENTS MEET WITH KHOMEYNI, EXPLAIN NEED FOR LAINGEN

LD111901 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 11, TASS--Ayatollah Khomeyni received in Qom a delegation of Iranian students who continue holding American hostages in the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. It is believed here that the students addressed Khomeyni with a request to issue a directive to the Foreign Ministry that it should turn over to them the U.S. Charge d'Affaires in Iran Laingen who is kept in the premises of the ministry. They already made such a demand to Foreign Minister Sadeq Qotbzadeh who answered that he would turn over Laingen to them only after the order from Khomeyni. The students said they need the American diplomat for the elucidation of the contents of espionage documents that were discovered in the embassy. Representative of Ayatollah Khomeyni said that a statement on the results of the meeting will be issued later.

According to the newspaper JOMHURIYE ESLAMI, security bodies of Iran arrested 50 members of the underground terroristic grouping "Forqan", among them its leader Akhbar Gudarzi. This ultra-reactionary organization that consisted mainly of former members of the shah's police SAVAK have set itself the aim of frustrating the process of revolutionary transformations through terror, of causing chaos and fear in the country. It is responsible for the assassination of a number of prominent political, military and religious leaders of the new regime. According to documents seized at the headquarters of "Forqan", said representative of Guards of the Islamic Revolution, the terrorists were planning to intensify their subversive activity and to stage shortly a number of political assassinations, particularly to assassinate head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Hashemi Rafsanjani and Ayatollah Khalkhali.

KHOMEYNI SPEECH, INCIDENTS IN TABRIZ REPORTED

LD132154 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 13, TASS--Speaking at a meeting with representatives of students, who hold the building of the American Embassy in Tehran, Ayatollah Khomeyni has said that "United States should understand that it will be no success in its sanctions against Iran, since the changes taking place in Iran are too deep and substantial to be undermined by such measures."

The ayatollah emphasized that at the present stage Washington's main aim is "to strike a blow at the Islamic revolution from within".

The situation in the north-eastern part of Iran remains extremely tense. Bloody clashes took place in Tabriz yesterday as a result of instigatory activities of proimperialist elements. The press reports arsons of institutions, banks, cars, numerous exchanges of fire provoked by imperialist agents. 12 instigators of disorders were arrested and shot.

KHOMEYNI ATTACKS CALL FOR ISLAMIC CONFERENCE ON AFGHANISTAN

LD111628 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The American administration has sent messages to some Arab and other Muslim countries pressing their leaders consent to attend an Islamic conference. The conference is to deal with the Afghan question. Among those who are advocating it are Egypt and some other countries that follow in the wake of American foreign policy. The idea of the Islamic conference has come under strong criticism in a number of Muslim countries. The Iranian leader Ayatollah Khomeyni has rejected the White House rhetoric in defense of the Islam. President Carter, said the ayatollah, expresses concern for the Islam and at the same time victimizes Muslims.

KARMAL REMARKS ON AFGHAN-ARAB 'FRATERNAL RELATIONS'

LD132230 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Beirut, January 13, TASS--Fraternal relations existed and will exist between revolutionary Afghanistan and Arab states, and also the Palestinian revolution and the Lebanese progressive forces, the newspaper AL-NIDA' has been told in an interview by President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal. The Afghan revolutionary leadership will comprehensively develop and strengthen these relations since the Afghan revolution and Arab countries are waging struggle against the common enemies--imperialism and Zionism.

AS-SADAT INVOLVED IN 'CONSPIRACIES' AGAINST AFGHANISTAN

LD132222 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 13 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Beirut, January 13, TASS--The As-Sadat regime has actively joined the campaign to further conspiracies of imperialist circles against the people's democratic revolution in Afghanistan. An official decision has been taken on forming in Egypt military camps for training saboteurs out of Afghan counter-revolutionaries and citizens of other nationalities who will then be sent to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for subversive activities against the legitimate government of that country.

That decision of the As-Sadat-headed ruling party of the Arab Republic of Egypt is a logical continuation of the anti-popular downright pro-imperialist course of the present Egyptian leadership. It is no secret that along with American, Chinese and Pakistani "specialists," Egyptian officers are also engaged in training and equipping bandit formations on the territory of Pakistan. Having become Washington's hanger-on, the Egyptian regime now zealously started furthering the plan drawn up by the U.S. ruling circles aimed at fanning up anti-Soviet sentiments in Islamic states.

As is reported by the Lebanese newspaper ASH-SHA'B, within the framework of that plan the U.S. CIA has already given instructions to its agents in Islamic countries to provoke all sorts of disorders, to commit provocations against Soviet institutions in those countries. Radio propaganda organs have simultaneously been given instructions to invigorate anti-Soviet broadcasts for Moslem countries.

The As-Sadat regime's participation in furthering dirty designs of imperialism and reaction encounters ever growing resistance of Egyptian patriots. Under the cover of the false slogan "of defending Islam from Soviet danger," says a statement of the Union of Egyptian Patriots Abroad that has been circulated here, As-Sadat is trying in vain to mislead the Egyptian people. The Egyptians became convinced from their own experience that the Soviet Union does not seek to impose its military presence contrary to the will of the people of that or [any] other country. Imperialism and Zionism, which seized Jerusalem, and also their agent and puppet As-Sadat, have no right whatsoever to act on behalf of Islam and Moslem peoples, it is stressed in the statement.

KUTAKHOV, OTHER MILITARY LEADERS ATTEND IRAQI RECEPTION

LD140923 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jan 80 p 3 LD

[TASS report: "To Mark the Army's Anniversary"]

[Text] On 7 January Lt Col R.N. Jasim, acting military attache at the Iraqi Embassy in the Soviet Union, held a reception to mark Armed Forces Day in the Republic of Iraq.

The reception was attended by Chief Marshal of Aviation P.S. Kutakhov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister; Col Gen G.V. Sredin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; generals, admirals and officers of the Soviet Army and Navy.

USSR AID TO NIGERIA RECALLED, COMPARED TO AFGHAN SITUATION

LD112352 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] January the 12th marks 10 years since the end of the civil war in Nigeria. Here is a comment from our observer, Vladlen Mikhaylov. This is what he writes:

The war clearly showed who is Nigeria's true friend. That war unmasked those who posed as Nigeria's traditional friends but who actually were the enemies of freedom and independence. According to the London FINANCIAL TIMES, oil was at the center of the conflict in Nigeria. Indeed, the main responsibility for the Nigerian tragedy, for the death of hundreds of thousands of Nigerians, was on the West and above all on the oil monopolies of the United States, Britain and other NATO countries. In an attempt to get hold of Nigeria's mineral resources, they supported the Biafra separatists morally and materially and supplied their forces with arms. Those Western monopolies sponsored and financed the so-called Biafra defense committees, which were engaged in fund-raising, recruiting mercenaries and supplying the separatists with arms.

As the noted Nigerian journalist (Stanley Orobato) wrote, the NATO powers preferred to observe how the Nigerians killed each other, waiting for the moment when to get hold of Nigerian oil, to share it between themselves. Siding with the Biafra separatists were South African racists, Israeli Zionists--in short, all the reactionaries of the world. Beijing, too, officially recognized the Biafra regime and zealously backed it at that time. The Soviet Union took an entirely different stand. It not only supported the Nigerian patriots morally but granted the Nigerian federal authorities military assistance which, according to them, was crucial to routing the separatists. We may recall that in those years the news media in the West and also in Beijing accused the Soviet Union of meddling in Nigeria's internal affairs. They accused the Soviet Union of trying to (?subvert) that country. Those charges were not surprising, because the West acts this way every time the Soviet Union comes to the help of the nations that have fallen victim to aggression, who ask for the help of national liberation fighters. The Soviet Union regards such help as its internationalist duty. That is how it was in 1975 when the Soviet Union, along with Cuba, helped the Angolan people to rebuff the aggression by racist South Africa. That was how it was during the recent events in the Horn of Africa, and this is what is taking place now when the Soviet Union is giving assistance to the Afghan people.

The civil war in Nigeria and other events have shown the African nations that they can rely on the Soviet Union as their true friend who champions the freedom and independence of all nations, durable and universal peace.

BRAZIL, ARGENTINA REFUSE TO JOIN U.S. BOYCOTT AGAINST USSR

PA220402 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish 0130 GMT 12 Jan 80 PA

[Text] The most important Latin American countries have rejected Washington's appeal to boycott trade with the Soviet Union. In this respect Argentina and Brazil have given official responses. The attitude of these countries was expressed on the eve of the inauguration in the U.S. capital of an international meeting during which the United States intends to form an anti-Soviet economic alliance.

Due to this the U.S Government will have a difficult time in creating the alliance. The open break of Argentina and Brazil with the Washington line is dictated by national interests which, especially during recent years, have been in conflict with the selfish attitude of their great neighbor to the north. Its protectionism and all sorts of economic reprisals against the Latin Americans long ago established the conditions for the division of interests.

In addition to this, the Carter's team [words indistinct] opens new export possibilities for Latin America. The Brazilian minister of agriculture said if the United States suspends trade with the Soviet Union it will allow other potential exporters to sell their agricultural products. Observers note that Brazilians should avoid the scheduled meeting with State Department officials. Brazilian officials want to avoid discussions and pressure from Washington which wants support for its hostile activities against Iran and Afghanistan.

All this allows one to conclude that the largest South American country is getting closer and closer to the boundary between conflicts of interest and confrontations with the United States.

In order to be objective, we must admit that the blame falls on the irresponsible directors of the U.S. foreign policy. Blinded by power and wealth these officials cannot understand that there are other interests, concerns, [word indistinct] and ways of thinking. They believe that only they are right, are infallible and know just what the world needs. What is more, using its military power, the United States imposes its conditions on other countries. In polictical language this is called imperialism and hegemonism. These are two characteristics completely alien to [words indistinct].

In spite of the strong pressures of the United States and its allies [words indistinct] challenge imperialism. If this is the case with Argentina and Brazil, whose regimes cannot be called leftist, it can be said the world has really substantially changed.

Argentinian Foreign Ministry Statement

LD111250 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Argentina has officially rejected Washington's unceremonious demand that it join in U.S. attempts to make grain-producing countries follow plans favored by the imperialists for reducing supplies of grain to the USSR. A statement by that country's Foreign Ministry notes that Argentina most decidedly refuses to participate in decisions or repressive measures undertaken without prior consultations with Argentina or drawn up at centers abroad.

REASONS FOR MUSLIM RELIGIOUS 'SURVIVALS' ANALYZED

LD111359 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 20 Dec 79 p 3 LD

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof I. Dzhabbarov under the rubric "Light Against Darkness": "Social Progress and Atheism"]

[Excerpts] The All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers pointed out that the solution of fundamental problems of communist education can be implemented only on the basis of a deep scientific understanding of them. Even now the practice of atheist work sometimes lacks a deep and at the same time concrete knowledge of the reasons for the tenacity of certain religious survivals under conditions of socialism, the essence of modernized religion and its social function. Consequently, it is the paramount task of scientific atheism to profoundly reveal the historical and sociopsychological reasons for the preservation and manifestation of surviving religious customs in our life.

A study has shown that although tremendous successes have been achieved in Uzbekistan in overcoming religious survivals, the religious question requires in-depth research. Even now one encounters religious wedding ceremonies among the population, baptisms, circumcision and religious funeral services. Holy places are still venerated and tabibs and mullahs are still consulted for the treatment of diseases and ailments.

As the All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers rightly stated, in atheist propaganda we must "resolutely eradicate phenomena, alien to genuine science, such as speculative argument, scholasticism, quotationmongering, superficial commentary and also formalistic exercises in the guise of innovation."

The system of atheist education cannot be divorced from the specific objective conditions in which it is employed. Its effectiveness will be guaranteed when it is supported and reinforced by a complex of socioeconomic and cultural measures. That is, it is necessary to take account of the dialectical unity of objective conditions and subjective factors in the implementation of atheist education.

V.I. Lenin attached tremendous significance to propaganda and stressed that the multimillion-strong masses will not be able to escape from the darkness, ignorance and prejudices "merely via the straight line of purely Marxist enlightenment" and that antireligious propaganda must be combined with the struggle for revolutionary transformations in society In present-day terms this means that the implementation of the party's socioeconomic measures, the improvement of the people's material well-being and cultural standard and the development of science and education create the objective basis making it possible to effectively solve the tasks of atheist education. The objective factors, in particular the system of social relations, the level of culture and education, housing and living conditions and the moral atmosphere (in the collective and the family) ultimately play a determining role by creating favorable prerequisites for overcoming religion. According to sociological research data, the religiosity of the population has fallen by a factor of 2.5 in the country's main areas compared with the previous generation.

Under modern conditions the attack mounted by some atheists against the dogmas of Islam using striking, pointed epithets has little effect. It is often like firing a blank cartridge and has negative repercussions. As is known, in our country, where the propaganda and study of religious ideology was stopped at the beginning of Soviet power, the content and character of the population's religiosity changed long ago and a substantial majority of Muslim believers is quite unacquainted with the Koran and the requirements of the Shari'a. But some atheists underestimate this fact.

Research carried out in our republic shows that 36 percent of the people who observe religious rites do so under the influence of parents, relatives or the environment. Some 35 percent do so through force of habit, 19 percent for want of a fitting substitute, that is, new rites, and only 10 percent for religious reasons. Therefore, from the viewpoint of increasing the effectiveness of atheist education, researchers, propagandists and atheists should direct their efforts toward the profound study of the essence and character of the most tenacious elements of Islam and pre-Islamic beliefs and the manifestation of religious consciousness by a certain part of the population during the period of developed socialism and toward discovering ways of overcoming it. This, of course, by no means signifies abandoning criticism of dogmatic Islam. Criticism of religious dogmas and particularly modernist trends among the clergy has been and still is an important problem of scientific atheism.

In this connection there is concern at the tendency evident in a certain sector of the intelligentsia to underestimate the reactionary role of Islam in the everyday life, behavior and consciousness of Soviet people and the fact that surviving religious customs and the observance of old harmful traditions, rites and rituals are overtly ignored or completely tolerated. To bank on the spontaneous extinction of religion under the conditions of our society is tremendously damaging to atheist work.

It must not be forgotten that the quarrel with religion currently centers on the problems of morality. In an attempt to keep their hold over believers and to recruit new followers, the clergy maintain that religion is necessary to the education of the highest morality. In their daily preaching activity the Muslim clergy stubbornly advocates the idea that the principles of communist morality are identical to those of Islamic morality and of the latter's lofty mission in consolidating our moral ideals. Therefore, it is necessary to counterpose our communist morals to religious morals, reveal their profound opposition and mold in the consciousness of believers a belief in the lofty moral qualities of the man of socialist society free from religion. Religious ideas about the purpose and meaning of life and man's role and place in society must be countered by the Marxist concept of life and its meaning, of real human happiness and the social role of the individual. The revelation of the full majesty and beauty of the moral ideals of communism contributes to the further expulsion of religious remnants from Soviet people's everyday life and consciousness.

CHAKOVSKIY COUNTERS CHARGES OF 'SPLIT' IN SOVIET LITERATURE

LD111053 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Dec 79 pp 2, 3 LD

[Aleksandr Chakovskiy article under the rubric "The Artist and the Age": "The Word of Truth Is Our Weapon"; capitalized passages published in boldface type]

[Text] According to [19th century Russian critic] Belinskiy literature "is the consciousness of the people, the flower and fruit of their spiritual life." This is particularly true in relation to socialist literature. That is why one should not be surprised that from the moment of its conception it became the target of the class and ideological struggle between the old world and the new. It is also natural that the best representatives of world culture became its friends right at the dawn of Soviet literature--friends and defenders of a society whose spiritual life it expressed and continues to express. It is also no accident that Romain Rolland, Henri Barbusse, G.B. Shaw and many other writers, who in their time "voted" for socialism, are depicted by our ideological opponents today as proper little simpletons who were swindled and cheated by the communists. A number of books have been published on this topic in the West recently. Their authors also openly take up arms against Western cultural figures who have become active participants in the movement in defense of peace--a movement which the cold war apostles regard as one of the communists' insidious "tricks".

Times are changing. Millions of people in the world, who share and support the ideas of our peace program, adopted at the 24th and developed at the 25th CPSU Congress, are now raising their voices in defense of the future generations' happiness, are angrily protesting at the attempts of the NATO leaders and their American bosses to increase the threat of nuclear war. The latest such attempt was made recently before our eyes under the "modest" label of Western Eurpoe's "missile upgrading" affixed to an infernal machine of tremendous power.

Politics have their own logic. While undertaking political and even potentially military actions against socialism, the bourgeois world is also toughening the struggle against the spititual world of the land of the soviets, and consequently against Soviet literature too. The weapons are being "modernized," but the target remains unchanged. The aim is to disparage, defame and distort the true complexion of Soviet society.

It is said that certain prehistoric monsters died out because they had too much armor and too little intelligence. Is it not their "spiritual heirs" who want to plunge the world into a new arms race to the accompaniment of cries about the "Soviet military threat" and imagined "violations of human rights" in the free world of socialism?

It is our bitter duty to state that among the Western anti-Soviets one also encounters writers who have forgotten that this lofty title itself demands their active participation in the struggle for social progress, peace and a better life for mankind.

Among the chorus of apologists for war one would be hard put to find another voice containing so much misanthropic and truly wild fanaticism as the voice of such a "humanist," if you will pardon the expression, as the British writer Anthony Burgess, author of the book upon which was based the dismal utopian film "A Clockwork Orange," which caused a sensation in the West, the novel "1985" and numerous articles. In the glorification of war Burgess left even the ideologists of fascism far behind. For him war is the "fastest way of spreading culture...." If we may interpret the concept "pornography" broadly, the position of this writer would be most correctly described by the words "ideological and political pornography."

Ideological struggle at the contemporary stage is characterized by a close interweaving of purely political and, conventionally speaking, literary trends. Militarist slogans are being propagated under the guise of literary argument, and the shameful decadence [padeniye] of Burgess, who is obsessed by a dream of the mass annihilation of people, is just one example of such interweaving.

As for specifically Soviet literature, the general position of the majority of bourgeois critics writing about it is perhaps contained in the formula: "We haven't read it but we are certain that it is bad," that is, although we have not read it, are not acquainted with it and know hardly anything apart from individual names, we nevertheless do not accept it, we reject it in advance and condemn it. For example, without bothering with specific analysis, the American writer Doctorow states that "the writer who binds himself firmly to a definite ideology creates stillborn material." Well, how can one fail to recall here Gogol's Khivra who wailed: Even though I haven't seen your aunt I know she's a scoundrel.

There is nothing unusual in the bourgeois critics' display of their ignorance when it comes to Soviet literature. The new element, though, is that they have recently been combining ignorance not only with the intention to slander Soviet literature but also to provocatively divide it.

After all, if literature--this "fruit of the people's spiritual life"--is "divided," then it is no longer difficult to impose on people the idea that society itself and the people themselves are "split." But few people will believe this. This means a "symbol of a split" must be sought in literature, which is easier, since for many people in the West literature, which is easier, since for many people in the West literature is the "aunt" which they "haven't seen and do not know."

Springer's newspaper DIE WELT printed an article by Peter Jokostra, which said: "The range of modern Soviet literature which is no longer subject to the principle of 'Socialist realism' is sizable and is continuing to expand. On one side are the old masters who used to have to write as "Stalinism" dictated and to remain silent about a great deal: Veniamin Kaverin, Yuriy Trifonov, and Sergey Zalygin, and on the other side are Valentin Rasputin and certain other authors. They represent a nonschematized literature which even includes 'magical' components which signifies an absolutely total break with the state literature of the past."

So it emerges: If our writers are "similar" to each other, this is evidence of the "decadence" of literature. If however, as is completely natural, they differ in theme, style and in creative individuality, this is evidence of a "fatal split" in literature.

It is difficult to say which predominates in these claims: self-befuddling malice or elementary ignorance.

It is known that a fairly large group of our writers work in the so-called "rustic prose" genere. The best of them have repeatedly been written about in critiques. Their talent, knowledge of everyday life in the countryside, and their ability to create vivid human characters has been noted. Sometimes certain authors have been rightly reproached for their unwarranted passion for the patriarchal, and insufficient attention to the real problems of the modern kolkhoz countryside. This gave the West German Sovietologist Ellen von Sachnow a pretext not only to harp on about "Russian literature" having "split" but also to try to convince her readers that Soviet "rustic" literature interprets socialism not as historical virgin soil, but as a continuation of Russian life." What Von Sachnow means is a "continuation" which "bypasses" socialism....

It would of course be unjust to claim that all bourgeois critics of Soviet literature without exception are inherently blind to true reality. Here two tendencies can be clearly discerned.

For example, there is a catastrophic decline in interest in the slanderously anti-Soviet mass-produced literature and in turncoats who earn their living in a shameful manner. It is, after all, a fact that people are ceasing to buy their books despite the most persistent advertising. And now Western publishers are already compelled to turn increasingly frequently to genuine Soviet literature, to those works which are hard to keep secret from the Western public.

Of course the works of Soviet authors published in the West are accompanied by articles and commentaries often distorting their ideological thrust, incorrectly representing their place in the general stream of our literature and sometimes foisting completely false and totally unjustified conclusions upon the readers. And the main one of these is that Soviet writers have allegedly discarded socialist realism as a creative method and have lost interest in social questions altogether. The idea about the "slow dying out of ideology in the East" is repeated in every possible way.

There is just one thing which is incomprehensible: If communist ideology is outdated, against what are bourgeois ideologists fighting so ferociously? Are they really tilting at windmills? No, they are fighting against reality, against the reality of the existence of our multinational literature, permeated with the ideas of communism.

We wage the struggle against our ideological opponents primarily through our books but also through the spoken word of the Soviet citizen-writer. We have works which set themselves an overtly political goal--the struggle in those forward positions where particularly fierce ideological skirmishes are taking place. These are political novels and stories, devoted to Soviet diplomacy and its struggle for peace, books exposing the ideology of imperialism, which is alien to us, and the intrigues of the Western special services. And of course in speaking of the authors of such militantly politicized works, one recalls the books of S. Dangulov, Yu. Semenov, D. Kraminov, Ts. Solodar and also the vivid articles and books which hit out at the bourgeois way of life, written by N. Gribachev, E. Genri, G. Borovik, A Krivitskiy, V. Korotich, V. Syrokomskiy and a number of other authors whose works are well known to readers. But it would be incorrect to think that these acutely polemical novels, pamphlets and articles are alone the effective weapons in the ideological struggle. Perhaps the "literary climate" is made up most of all by works showing the Soviet man under actual conditions and reflecting the everyday--I emphasize this--reality in which our people live and the spiritual atmosphere of this life.

And it is against this reality that the anti-Soviets take up arms. Let us look, for example, at the activity of the West German magazine L-76. "Not timid demarcation but an aggressive debate with communism--this should be the motto"--this is Guenter Grass' definition of the task.

And the struggle against communism is, of course, the anti-Soviets' "No one task." This includes the anti-Soviets operating in the literary sphere.

Unfortunately, even a writer like Alberto Moravia has taken up this struggle. Last year he published in CORRIERE DELLA SERA an article in which he admitted that the appeals in defense of Soviet dissidents which he had signed and would continue to sign and the "roundtable conversations" he had participated in on this theme bear little fruit. Something more radical is needed here. A coup? No, Moravia rejects violence for a number of reasons, but he "recommends" the adoption in the USSR of "laws transforming the very system." No more, no less.

While rebuffing the anti-Soviets, we pursue a line toward uniting writers who advocate peace, detente and confidence-building among the peoples and we are seeking to rally them on the platform of the Final Act of the all-European conference in Helsinki. We hold regular bilateral meetings with writers from the United States, Italy, Spain, Finland, France, West Germany and many Asian and African countries, with all who agree to participate in such meetings for the good of the cause of friendship and peace among the peoples.

Soviet writers' active participation in the work of various international literary organizations and associations is also indicative of our good will toward broad cooperation.

But, as in any political struggle, complacency would be the greatest danger. And it is even more dangerous to be oblivious to the fact that our opponents are following our activity attentively and taking advantage of our every slip. And, unfortunately, these slips do occur....

The recent All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers noted that literary figures are making a considerable contribution to the spiritual development of the Soviet person but, at the same time, lackluster works continue to appear alongside the talented and high-principled novels, plays and movies. On occasions one discerns a trend toward escaping into petty themes, naturalistic description of everyday life and into the world of narrow-minded petty passions and the superficial portrayal of the present day. In some works one finds distorted pictures of the past and attempts to arouse unwarranted interest in political rogues while steering clear of the true history of Russia.

Some of our writers have the impression that they display their creative individuality and join the "league of classic writers" if they start to neglect the social aspects of our social existence. These "trends," even if there is nothing behind them apart from ambition and literary snobbism (as, for example, in the case of the authors of the infamous "Metropol"), are noticed by our opponents who regard any instance of this kind as being worth its weight in gold and circulate it as proof of that same gross idea of a split in our literature.

For example, Thomas Whitney compiled a special anthology entitled "The New Writing in Russia" and in the foreword he announced the "depoliticization" of Soviet literature had arrived. He stressed that the anthology contains solely "...works that are APOLITICAL in the sense that they concern...Russian people as ORDINARY HUMAN BEINGS and not Russian patriots, Soviet citizens, the implementation of the Soviet Communist Party's plans...nor problems of 'building communism'...." "I am deeply convinced," Whitney writes, "that Russian literature...will develop precisely along these lines...."

No, not along these lines! At the same time, however, it must be remembered that our opponents are bound to be attracted by any departure from the principles of Marxist-Leninist analysis. And departures of this kind are still to be found, unfortunately, in our literary criticism and in our fictional prose. Not long ago we encountered the following assertion: "...Russian culture took shape, symbolically speaking, not just along a line from Radishchev, through the Decembrists, Belinskiy and Chernyshevskiy, to Gorkiy, but also along another line from Avvakum, through the Slavophiles, Dostoyevskiy and Tyutchev, to Bunin, bequeathing things of unfading value to their descendants." Why did the literary critic need to use this trenchant parallel, and what is more, without appending any comment? Would it not have been better to ascertain objectively, on the basis of Leninist, class principles of analysis, what aspects of the legacy of the prominent Russian cultural figures included in the "other" line live on today and what are weak or even reactionary aspects of their creative work?

A number of publications have attempted to rehabilitate reactionary figures of the past or to all but call mercantile "Zamoskvorechye" ["After the Moscow Speeches], which was ridiculed by Ostrovskiy, the source of people's morality and morals.

What is the point of trying to revise the established assessments of such an odious figure from Russian literary history as Bulgarian? Or wanting to find the key to the complicated spiritual world of Dostoyevski and to his creative legacy in the writing of bourgeois philosophers like Berdyayev?

We contemptuously reject the fabrications about the division of Soviet literature into kinds of salons in one of which sit "deideologized ruralists" upon a stylized mound of earth gazing at the brooks and birches like navel-contemplating yogis and gathering together in their rather limited spiritual storehouses the desultory thoughts of certain reactionary native philosophers; while in the other "salon," allegedly "in jeans and by candlelight," sit young and aging literary fops for whom Western fashion is the only real life.

We must all remember that from our books, people abroad judge not only Soviet literature per se, but also our society, its stability, the strength of its resistance to imperialist ideology and whether there are chinks in our society which can be penetrated. The bourgeoisie and its ideologists, the party Central Committee resolution pegged to the portentous Lenin anniversary says, "are seeking to belittle the worldwide historic significance of Marxist-Leninist teaching and socialism's successes and to discredit the socialist way of life."

We must do away with the snobbish attitude, current in some literary circles, toward the clear expression of social-mindedness. But it must be confessed that sometimes, out of, so to speak, philanthropy, we are prepared to pass off attempts to use the literary cliches of modernism as "bold, risky experimentation" and the counterposing of countryside to city and hostalgia for moribund remnants of the patriarchal outlook as the nurturing of real morality. We must talk about all this in a principled but calm manner without immoderate outbursts which, as a rule, produce an atmosphere of factionalism which is always disastrous for creative work. It must not be forgotten that the firm establishment of communist ideological content in literature and the criticism of its shortcomings take place not in a vacuum but against the background of the broad, multifaceted ideological struggle.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has talked more than once about the need to defend and propagandize the truth about real socialism--our most powerful weapon. After all, all the enemy's attacks are aimed ultimately at discrediting the experience and achievements of real socialism, at undermining and splitting the world communist movement.

Each of us must struggle in the ideological sphere, guided by a sense of responsibility toward the party, our people and the peoples of the world!

BURYATIYA CONFLICT RESULTS IN PARTY EXPULSION, REPRIMANDS

LD101257 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 December 1979 publishes on page 2, under the headline "Be Doubly Vigilant," a 2,00-word feature following up PRAVDA's publication on 29 September 1979 of a letter from one L. Kazantsev, an engineer from Buryatia, describing his conflict with P. Khundanov, manager of the Barguzinsk branch of the State Committee for the Supply of Agricultural Equipment (Goskomselkhoztekhnika), over malpractices in the branch's work. The feature consists of letters from PRAVDA readers commenting on the attitudes displayed by the parties to the conflict and on the issues raised by the events, followed by an account from Buryatskiy Obkom First Secretary A. Modogoyev of the measures taken in the wake of Kazantsev's complaints and their publication in PRAVDA.

Modogoyev notes that an investigation by a "special commission" confirmed the truth of Kazanstev's allegations and that as a result "the CPSU Obkom bureau decided to expel Khundanov from the party" and criminal proceedings have been instituted. He continues:

"A. Basanov, chairman of the Republic Goskomselkhoztekhnika Committee, has been reprimanded by the Obkom bureau for his formal attitude toward L. Kazantsev's letters and his failure to act on them. B. Bardamov, chief of the Republic Goskomselkhoztekhnika Committee Repair and Technical Services Administration, has also been reprimanded.

"A. Pakheyev, former deputy chairman of the Republic Goskomselkhoztekhnika Committee (now the autonomous republic's deputy minister of agriculture), has been strictly censured for his negligent attitude toward letters about the shortcomings in the Barguzinsk branch's work."

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 9 JANUARY

LD110734 [Editorial Report LD] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 9 January. The time of the broadcast is given in parentheses at the end of the item:

Preparation of seeds for spring sowing is coming to an end in Kustanayskaya Oblast. This spring strong wheat will be sown on 3.5 million hectares, chiefly the high-yield Saratovskaya-29 and Bezenchukskaya-98 varieties. For the first time almost 500,000 hectares will be sown with the new, locally-selected variety Uralskaya-52, which is better adapted than others to virgin-land conditions.

AGRICULTURE OFFICIAL DISCUSSES LIVESTOCK WINTERING

LD120020 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 11 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Here is a commentary by Vyacheslav Mikhaylovich Kozhevnikov, chief of the Directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture of the USSR:

On the kolkhozes and sovkhozes throughout the country there is a responsible campaign of wintering of cattle currently in progress. In the current year kolkhozes and sovkhozes have to carry out enormous work in increasing the production and sale of livestock products to the state. The purchases of dairy livestock and poultry in comparison with 1979 must increase by 4 percent and eggs by 3 percent. The future prospects for wintering and the fulfillment of set tasks in many ways depends on the good use of reserves for the increase in livestock and poultry meat. Main attention at present is concentrated on the preservation of complete herds of cattle and the more effective use of every kilogram of fodder.

It must be noted that on kolkhozes and sovkhozes throughout the country there are more animals wintering during the current (?period) than last year. In the past year it was not possible to create prior stocks of fodder at all farms. Taking this into account, on many kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the country great attention is being accorded to procurement of fodder in the form of [word indistinct]. On livestock farms there are about 80,000 fodder shops and fodder kitchens in operation. A large number of shops for fodder processing of straw have been put into operation. In the first months of wintering 26 million tons of crude fodder has been prepared.

The milk output of livestock in Belorussia, Latvia, Estonia and Tadzhikistan and in Kostromskaya, Vologodskaya, Zhitomirskaya, Poltavaskaya and a number of other oblasts is greater than last year.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Kazakhstan, Moldavia, Kirgizia and Estonia are providing cattle for meat in a much higher condition of weight than during the last wintering period. The increase in weight conditions is a major reserve in the increase in meat production. However, not everywhere are the necessary measures being undertaken in the organized wintering of livestock. A great quantity of fodder shops have not been put into operation at kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Kalininskaya, Kalugachskaya, Orelskaya, Voronezhskaya, Smolenskaya and some other oblasts of the Russian Federation.

There are shortcomings in the procurement of fodder in the [names indistinct] Gureyevskaya and Dzhambulskaya oblasts in Kazakhstan. On livestock farms there are still many reserves which can be used for increasing production of all kinds of products.